VICTORIA UNIVERSITY
3 1761 02707993 8

ANNEX

Board of Missionary Preparation

SECOND ANNUAL MEETING

BV
2360
B5
no. 2
EMMANUEL

New York, December 6, 1912

REPORT *of the* SECOND ANNUAL MEETING *of the* BOARD *of* MISSIONARY PREPARATION

(FOR NORTH AMERICA)

HELD IN

NEW YORK CITY

December 6, 1912

Published by order of the Board

600 Lexington Avenue, New York

BV
2360
B5
no. 2

EMMANUEL

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

Constitution 4

Members of Board and Officers for 1913 6

PART I.

Minutes second annual meeting 7

Action of Foreign Missions Conference 12

PART II.

Opening address 13

Committee I.—"Plans and practice of foreign missionary boards as to the preparation required of their candidates." Report and discussion 17-46

Committee II.—"The present facilities afforded missionary candidates in Institutions and 'Movements,' and further facilities for the training of missionary candidates needed, especially in the following subjects: (1) Science and History of Missions. (2) Religions of the World. (3) Sociology. (4) Pedagogy. 5. Science of Language and Language of Different Fields. 6. English Bible." Report and discussion 47-73

Committee III.—"Courses of reading for candidates under appointment for foreign missionary service." Report 76-77

Committee IV.—"The fundamental qualifications for missionary work." Report and discussion 78-93

CONSTITUTION

I. Name.

The Board shall be called "The Board of Missionary Preparation (for North America)."

[By unanimous consent of the Foreign Missions Conference at Garden City in January, 1913, the name of the Board was changed to the Board of Missionary Preparation.]

II. Aim.

The Board of Missionary Preparation shall have for its aim to secure the most adequate kind and quality of preparation for those who are in training for foreign missionary service.

III. Organization.

1. The Board of Missionary Preparation shall be appointed by and be responsible to The Foreign Missions Conference of North America.

2. It shall be composed of not more than thirty-six members, who shall be appointed for not over three years. At the first appointment they shall be arranged in three groups appointed for one, two and three years, respectively. Members shall be eligible for re-election.

3. All vacancies shall be filled by The Foreign Missions Conference of North America from nominations made by The Board of Missionary Preparation, except that vacancies occurring during the year may be filled by the Executive Committee of the Board to serve until the next meeting of The Foreign Missions Conference.

4. The officers of The Board of Missionary Preparation shall consist of a Chairman and a Secretary, which shall be appointed by The Foreign Missions Conference on the nomination of the Board from the members of the Board, and who shall be members *ex-officio* of the Executive Committee of the Board.

5. The Board of Missionary Preparation shall appoint annually an Executive Committee of seven in addition to the officers above named, making nine in all, whose duties shall be to carry out the aims of the Board under the methods hereinafter defined, and to report its transactions in full to the Board.

6. The Board shall hold an annual meeting at which it shall hear the annual report of its Executive Committee, consider all matters proper to its general aim, appoint its Executive Committee for the following year, and prepare its own annual report to the Conference. Other meetings of the Board may be held at the call of the Executive Committee. A majority of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

7. The Board shall have the power to create special co-operating committees, to include persons not members of the Board, for the purpose of making specific investigations or carrying out specific and temporary projects, the chairman in each case to be appointed from the members of the Board.

IV. Methods.

1. The Board shall urge the importance and need of special missionary preparation as emphasized in the Report of Commission V to The World Missionary Conference, 1910.

2. The Board, through its Executive Committee and its officers, shall enter into correspondence with similar Boards in Europe, with Missionary Boards, with Theological Seminaries and Colleges, with Missionary Training Schools, with missionary leaders at home and abroad, and with institutions for special missonary preparation on the field, to discover both what is being done and what ought to be done for the best equipment of the missionary.

3. It shall maintain correspondence with Missionary Boards for the purpose of acquiring information and affording aid in the adequate preparation of prospective missionaries.

4. It shall be ready to assist young men and women who desire information and advice regarding the best way in which they individually may acquire the training necessary for their respective forms and fields of missionary service, in harmony with the policy and plans of the several Boards concerned.

5. It shall be ready to advise with the officers and teachers of Theological Seminaries and Colleges and Special Missionary Training Schools, regarding the subjects and methods of missionary preparation, to help them in finding suitable teachers or lecturers.

6. It shall be ready to advise with missionaries on furlough, who have strength and inclination for the pursuit of studies which they feel important for their future work, as to the best manner of fulfilling their desire.

V. Amendments.

This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of The Foreign Missions Conference of North America, provided a written notice shall have been given to The Board of Missionary Preparation and all the Boards and Societies represented in the Conference at least three months in advance.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Term Expiring in 1914

President W. Douglas MacKenzie, D.D., Hartford, Connecticut.
Professor Ernest D. Burton, Chicago, Illinois.
Professor Charles R. Erdman, Princeton, New Jersey.
President Henry C. King, Ph.D., Oberlin, Ohio.
Rt. Rev. Arthur S. Lloyd, D.D., New York City.
Rev. R. P. MacKay, D.D., Toronto, Ontario.
President E. Y. Mullins, D.D., Louisville, Kentucky.
Professor G. A. Johnston Ross, M.A., New York City.
Dean Wilford L. Robbins, D.D., New York City.
Bishop Homer C. Stuntz, D.D., New York City.
Miss Helen B. Calder, Boston, Massachusetts.

Term Expiring in 1915

Professor John H. Strong, Ph.D., Rochester, New York.
Mrs. A. F. Schauffler, New York City.
Rev. Charles R. Watson, D.D., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
John R. Mott, LL.D., New York City.
Rev. Frank Mason North, D.D., New York City.
President C. T. Paul, Ph.D., Indianapolis, Indiana.
Dean James E. Russell, Ph.D., New York City.
T. H. P. Sailer, Ph.D., New York City.
Robert E. Speer, D.D., New York City.
Rev. T. E. Edgerton Shore, D.D., Toronto, Ontario.
President Wilbert W. White, Ph.D., New York City.

Term Expiring in 1916

Rev. James L. Barton, D.D., Boston, Massachusetts.
Professor Martin G. Brumbaugh, Ph.D., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Professor O. E. Brown, D.D., Nashville, Tennessee.
Professor Harlan P. Beach, M.A., New Haven, Connecticut.
Professor Edward W. Capen, Ph.D., Hartford, Connecticut.
Rev. William I. Chamberlain, Ph.D., New York City.
Luther Halsey Gulick, M.D., New York City.
Rev. Fred. P. Haggard, D.D., Boston, Massachusetts.
President W. W. Moore, D.D., Richmond, Virginia.
Principal T. R. O'Meara, Toronto, Ontario.
Fennell P. Turner, New York City.
Miss Addie Grace Wardle, Cincinnati, Ohio.

OFFICERS FOR 1913

President W. Douglas MacKenzie, D.D., *Chairman,*
Hosmer Hall, Hartford, Connecticut.

Mr. Fennell P. Turner, *Honorary Secretary,*
600 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

Rev. William I. Chamberlain, *Treasurer,*
25 East 22nd Street, New York City.

Executive Committee

James L. Barton, Ernest D. Burton, John R. Mott, Charles R. Erdman, T. E. Edgerton Shore, Mrs. A. F. Schauffler, William I. Chamberlain, W. Douglas MacKenzie, Fennell P. Turner.

PART I

MINUTES—SECOND ANNUAL MEETING

The Second Annual Meeting of the Board of Missionary Preparation was held in the Assembly Room of the Presbyterian Building, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, December 6, 1912. With short intermissions for luncheon and supper, the Board was in session from 9:30 A. M. to 8:00 P. M.

Present:

James L. Barton
Harlan P. Beach
Miss Helen B. Calder
Edward Warren Capen
William I. Chamberlain
Charles R. Erdman
Fred. P. Haggard
Henry C. King
W. Douglas Mackenzie
R. P. Mackay
C. T. Paul
G. A. Johnston Ross
James E. Russell
T. H. P. Sailer
T. E. Edgerton Shore
Robert E. Speer
John H. Strong
Fennell P. Turner
Wilbert W. White
Charles R. Watson

Dr. W. Douglas Mackenzie in the chair.

The devotional exercises were conducted by Dr. R. P. Mackay and Dr. John H. Strong. The open address was given by Dr. Mackenzie.

The report of the Executive Committee was presented by F. P. Turner, Honorary Secretary, as follows:

The Executive Committee begs to submit the following report since its appointment on December 6, 1911:

Meetings—Since the annual meeting of the Board of Missionary Preparation, held on December 6, 1911, at which the present Executive Committee was appointed, four meetings have been held, as follows: On December 6, 1911, in New York; on January 9, 1912, in New York; on April 5, 1912, in Montclair, N. J.; on December 5, 1912, in New York.

Membership of the Board—In accordance with the instructions of the Board at its annual meeting, the persons who accepted membership in the Board were divided into three groups, whose terms of office expire in one, two and three years (viz.: 1913, 1914, 1915), as follows:

1913.	1914.	1915.
James L. Barton,	Arthur S. Lloyd,	Robert E. Speer,
Martin G. Brumbaugh,	R. P. Mackay,	T. E. Egerton Shore,
O. E. Brown,	Homer C. Stuntz,	Charles R. Watson,
Edward W. Capen,	Helen B. Calder,	Mrs. A. F. Schauffler,
William I. Chamberlain,	Ernest D. Burton,	John H. Strong,
Luther H. Gulick,	W. Douglas Mackenzie,	George W. Knox,
Fred P. Haggard,	E. Y. Mullins,	Wilbert W. White,
W. W. Moore,	C. R. Erdman,	C. T. Paul,
T. R. O'Meara,	Wilford L. Robbins,	James E. Russell,
F. P. Turner,	Henry C. King,	T. H. P. Sailer,
Harlan P. Beach,	G. A. Johnston Ross.	John R. Mott.
Addie Grace Wardle.		

This division was confirmed by the action of the Foreign Missions Conference at its session in 1912.

It is necessary for the Board to nominate the persons to fill the vacancies of those whose terms expire in 1913.

We regret to have to report the death of Dr. George William Knox, of New York, a member of the Board, which occurred while he was on a visit to the Orient. Although Dr. Knox never attended a meeting of the Board he was greatly interested in the objects for which the Board was created. It is necessary to nominate a member to fill his term, which expires in 1915.

The Director—Much time and effort have been given to find a Director of the Board of Missionary Preparation, but we regret to report that we are not able to make a nomination at this time. One man well qualified for the work was selected, and approached. He gave the proposal careful consideration, but could not see his way clear to accept.

The Budget—The budget of the Board of Missionary Preparation and the method of raising the same was referred with power to the Executive Committee, with instruction to confer with the Committee of Reference and Counsel. After discussion, a sub-committee consisting of Messrs. Mackenzie, Chamberlain and Turner was appointed to bring the budget of the Board before the Committee of Reference and Counsel. This was done on December 7, 1911. The Committee of Reference and Counsel, after discussion, referred the matter to the Foreign Missions Conference at its session in 1912. After discussion, the Conference authorized this Board to "secure such sum as they may deem necessary, the same not to exceed $7,500 for the first year, the methods of securing this sum to be determined by the Board." In the judgment of the Executive Committee a budget of $7,500 should be authorized for 1913.

Committees for 1912—In considering the work to be done by the Board it was decided by the Executive Committee that certain investigations ought to be made in order that the problem of missionary preparation in the United States and Canada might be freshly studied. It was felt that this could best be done through committees, so the following committees were appointed:

Committee I—On Plans and Practice of Foreign Missionary Boards as to the preparation required of their candidates. (This committee is directed to secure also from the Boards information in regard to the problems about which they desire the help of the Board of Missionary Preparation.):

James L. Barton, Chairman; O. E. Brown, Fred P. Haggard, Mrs. A. F. Schauffler, T. E. E. Shore, Robert E. Speer.

Committee II—To Study the Present Facilities Afforded Missionary Candidates in Institutions and "Movements," and to discover what further facilities for the training of missionary candidates are needed, especially in the following subjects: (1) Science and History of Missions; (2) Religions of the World; (3) Sociology; (4) Pedagogy; (5) Science of Language and Language of Different Fields; (6) English Bible:

Charles R. Erdman, Chairman; E. D. Burton, Wilbert W. White, Miss Helen B. Calder, F. P. Turner, R. P. Mackay, E. Y. Mullins, Charles R. Watson.

Committee III—On Course of Reading for Candidates Under Appointment for Foreign Missionary Service and for Missionaries:

W. I. Chamberlain, Chairman; H. P. Beach, Henry C. King, Edward W. Capen, C. T. Paul, J. E. Russell, George W. Knox, T. H. P. Sailer

Committee IV—To Define the Fundamental Qualifications for Missionary Work:

W. D. Mackenzie, Chairman; James L. Barton, Charles R. Erdman, W. I. Chamberlain, John R. Mott.

These committees have made the investigations expected of them. The reports of three of them have been printed and were sent to all the members of the Board a few days ago. The report of Committee III. is in typewritten form and will be submitted to-day.

Report to the Foreign Missions Conference—At the request of the Executive Committee, our Chairman, Dr. W. Douglas Mackenzie, presented the Annual Report of the Board of Missionary Preparation to the Foreign Missions Conference at its nineteenth session, which was held at Garden City, Long Island, January 10-12. In addition to Dr. Mackenzie's report, the report of the Committee of Nineteen, which was appointed by the Foreign Missions Conference in 1911 to organize the Board, was presented by Dr. Arthur J. Brown, Chairman of that committee. These reports were discussed at some length by the members of the Conference, and the following resolutions, which were proposed by the Business Committee, were adopted:

Resolved, That the Conference approve of the following recommendations in the Report of the Board of Missionary Preparation:

1. MEMBERSHIP. That the classification of the membership of the Board, in accordance with Sec. III, Par. 2, of the Constitution governing the Board be as follows:

James L. Barton, Martin G. Brumbaugh, O. E. Brown, Edward W. Capen, William I. Chamberlain, Luther H. Gulick, Fred P. Haggard, W. W. Moore, T. R. O'Meara, F. P. Turner, Harlan P. Beach, Addie Grace Wardle (1913).

Arthur S. Lloyd, R. P. Mackay, Homer C. Stuntz, Helen B. Calder, Ernest D. Burton, W. Douglas Mackenzie, E. Y. Mullins, C. R. Erdman, Wilford L. Robbins, Henry C. King, G. A. Johnston Ross (1914).

Robert E. Speer, T. E. Edgerton Shore, Charles R. Watson, Mrs. A. F. Schauffler, John H. Strong, George W. Knox, Wilbert W. White, C. T. Paul, James E. Russell, T. H. P. Sailer, John R. Mott (1915).

2. OFFICERS: That the nomination of W. D. Mackenzie as Chairman, and F. P. Turner, as Honorary Secretary, to serve until the meeting of the Foreign Missions Conference in 1913 be confirmed. (See Constitution, Sec. III, Par. 4.)

3. BUDGET: That the Board of Missionary Preparation be authorized to secure such sum as they may deem necessary, the same not to exceed $7,500, for the first year (1912), the methods of securing this sum to be determined by the Board of Missionary Preparation.

(See pages 49-72, Foreign Missions Conference Report, 1912.)

The British Board of Study—We have kept in touch with the British Board of Study for the Preparation of Missionaries through the kindness of Dr. H. U. Weitbrecht, the Secretary. He has sent copies of minutes of the meetings of their executive and of their annual meeting, and kept us informed as to plans and work of the British Board through frequent letters and printed matter. At the time of his visit to London in February, 1912, the Honorary Secretary had the opportunity for conference with Dr. Weitbrecht, and with the Rev. Dr. Kilgour, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the British Board. Dr. John R. Mott was present and gave an address at the Annual Meeting of the British Board in March, 1912.

Recommendations—The Executive Committee offer the following recommendations:

1. That a Committee on Nominations be appointed. (1) To nominate persons to fill the vacancies of the members whose terms expire in 1913. (2) To nominate a member to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Dr. George W. Knox, whose term expires in 1915. (3) To nominate the officers and Executive Committee for the year 1913.

2. That a budget of $7,500 be authorized for 1913.

3. That a Director of the Board be secured as soon as possible.

4. That a report of the Board of Missionary Preparation be published to include the addresses and committee reports presented at this meeting of the Board.

5. That the Student Volunteer Movement be authorized to print in pamphlet form: (1) The report of the Committee on Fundamental Qualifications of Missionary Candidates. (2) The Bibliography, when prepared by the committee, on Courses of Reading for Missionary Candidates.

6. That the report and these pamphlets be made available for the various missionary boards and be distributed as widely as possible.

7. That the programme arranged by the Executive Committee be accepted as the order of the day.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Executive Committee.

The Chairman appointed on the Committee on Nominations J. H. Strong, C. R. Erdman, Miss Helen B. Calder.

On motion of Dr. King, the programme arranged by the Executive Committee and presented by the Secretary was accepted as the order of the day.

Under this order the reports of the committees were received and discussed as follows:

The Report of Committee I, on "plans and practice of foreign missionary boards as to the preparation required of their candidates," was presented by Dr. James L. Barton, chairman.

The Report was discussed by Dr. Charles R. Watson and Dr. T. E. Edgerton Shore, who spoke "from the viewpoint of a secretary of a mission board."

President H. C. King and Prof. H. P. Beach continued the discussion, speaking "from the viewpoint of an educationalist studying the work of the missionaries on the mission field."

Dr. T. H. P. Sailer spoke on "Specialization in the preparation of the foreign missionary candidate."

The report was also discussed by Dr. Robert E. Speer, President W. W. White, Prof. E. W. Capen and Dr. T. H. P. Sailer.

Prof. Charles R. Erdman, chairman, presented the report of Com-

mittee II, to "study the present facilities afforded missionary candidates in institutions and 'Movements,' and to discover what further facilities for the training of missionary candidates are needed, especially in the following subjects: (1) Science and History of Missions; (2) Religions of the World; (3) Sociology; (4) Pedagogy; (5) Science of Language and Language on Different Fields; (6) English Bible."

The discussion of the report was opened by the consideration of the question "Is it feasible to add the equivalent of a year's special work in missions to the present theological curriculum, or can this special training only be secured by requiring missionary candidates to take an extra year of study?"

A paper on this subject, prepared by Prof. Ernest D. Burton, who could not be present, was read by the Secretary.

Dr. R. P. Mackay and Prof. John H. Strong spoke to the question.

The question, "Where should the special training for missionary candidates be provided? In schools in the homeland or on the mission field?" was considered by Prof. C. T. Paul, Dr. Robert E. Speer and Dr. Edward W. Capen.

Dr. Fred P. Haggard spoke on "How shall the expense of special missionary training required of missionary candidates be provided? Is this a proper charge on the regular income of a Missionary Society?"

The following members of the Board took part in the discussion: Drs. T. H. P. Sailer, W. W. White, T. E. E. Shore, C. R. Watson, H. C. King, James L. Barton, F. P. Haggard and W. Douglas Mackenzie.

The Report of Committee III, on "Courses of reading for candidates under appointment for foreign missionary service," presented by Dr. W. I. Chamberlain, Chairman.

The report was discussed by Drs. C. R. Erdman, H. C. King, H. P. Beach, W. W. White, W. Douglas Mackenzie, R. P. Mackay, R. E. Speer, F. P. Haggard, T. E. E. Shore and G. A. Johnston Ross.

At the request of the Chairman, it was agreed that all members of the Board should send to the Chairman suggestions regarding courses of reading and the bibliography before December 20, 1912.

Report on Committee IV, to define the fundamental qualifications for missionary work was presented by President W. D. Mackenzie, Chairman.

The report was discussed by President W. W. White, Miss Helen B. Calder and Prof. G. A. Johnston Ross.

The report of the Committee on Nominations was adopted as follows:

Your Committee on Nominations would respectfully report as follows:

1. To fill vacancies due to the expiration of term of office of James L. Barton, Martin G. Brumbaugh, O. E. Brown, E. W. Capen, W. I. Chamberlain, Luther H. Gulick, F. P. Haggard, W. W. Moore, F. P. Turner, H. P. Beach, Addie G. Wardle. Terms will expire in 1916.

2. To fill the vacancy caused by the death of Professor George W. Knox, term expiring in 1915, Rev. Frank Mason North, D. D.

3. The Officers: For Chairman, W. D. Mackenzie; Honorary Secretary, F. P. Turner; for Treasurer, William I. Chamberlain.

4. The Executive Committee to be composed of the officers and James L. Barton, E. D. Burton, John R. Mott, Charles R. Erdman, T. E. E. Shore and Mrs. A. F. Schauffler.

(Signed) JOHN H. STRONG,
CHARLES R. ERDMAN,
HELEN B. CALDER,
Committee on Nominations.

On motion it was agreed that the date of the next annual meeting should be determined by the Executive Committee as soon as the date of the Continuation Committee meeting to be hld in Holland in 1913 is announced.

It was moved that the matter of nominating a Director of the Board be referred to the Executive Committee with power.

On motion, the Executive Committee was authorized to raise money for the expenses of the Board for 1913 not to exceed $7,500.

On motion of Dr. F. P. Haggard, the following action was taken regarding publications:

1. That the Executive Committee be authorized to publish a report of the Board of Missionary Preparation to include the committee reports presented at the second annual meeting and discussions of same.

2. That the Student Volunteer Movement be authorized to issue in pamphlet form, without expense to the Board: (1) The report of the Committee on Fundamental Qualifications of Missionary Candidates, and (2) the Bibliography on Courses of Reading for Missionary Candidates.

3. That this report and the pamphlets be made available for the mission boards and distributed as widely as possible in such manner as the Executive Committee may determine.

The proposal of Dr. Sailer that a pamphlet be prepared by the Board of Missionary Preparation for the use of Student Volunteers "specifying courses and lines of reading that would be most useful for evangelistic, medical or educational work," was referred to the Executive Committee.

The suggestion that meetings for the purpose of informing officers, members and friends of the Mission Boards regarding the work, plans and ideals of the Board of Missionary Preparation be held in centers which are the headquarters of the Mission Boards was referred to the Executive Committee.

Professor Erdman proposed the change of the name of the Board, and after considerable discussion and a number of suggestions the following resolution, proposed by Dr. Barton, was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the unanimous consent of the Foreign Missions Conference in January, 1913, be asked to change the name of the Board of Studies to the "Board of Missionary Preparation (for North America)."

Dr. H. C. King led in prayer, after which the Board adjourned.

ACTION BY FOREIGN MISSIONS CONFERENCE

At the Foreign Missions Conference, which met at Garden City, Long Island, on January 17, 1913, an hour was set aside for the presentation of the work of the Board of Missionary Preparation.

Dr. Mackenzie spoke on the work of the Board during the year 1912. Dr. Barton presented the report of the Committee on the "Plan and Practice of Foreign Missionary Boards as to the preparation required of their candidates." In the absence of Drs. Erdman and Chamberlain, Mr. F. P. Turner presented the reports of their committees.

The following items of business which, under the Constitution of the Board of Missionary Preparation, require action of the Conference were presented by F. P. Turner:

1. The following persons are nominated to fill the vacancies caused by expiration of terms of office: James L. Barton, Harlan P. Beach, Martin G. Brumbaugh, O. E. Brown, Edward W. Capen, William I. Chamberlain, Luther H. Gulick, Fred. P. Haggard, W. W. Moore, T. R. O'Meara, F. P. Turner, Addie Grace Wardle. (Term expires in 1916.)
2. To fill the unexpired term caused by the death of George W. Knox, expiring in 1915, Frank Mason North.
3. The following officers are nominated for 1913: Chairman, W. Douglas Mackenzie; Honorary Secretary, Fennell P. Turner; Treasurer, William I. Chamberlain.
4. If the work of the Board is carried on as it should be with a Director, a budget of not less than $7,500 will be required. Authority is asked by the Executive Committee to secure that sum if it be needed.
5. By unanimous action of the Board, we ask unanimous consent of the Foreign Missions Conference to change the name of the Board to the following: The "Board of Missionary Preparation (for North America)." The experience of the past year shows that this change of name is necessary in order to avoid confusion.

Favorable action was unanimously taken by the Foreign Missions Conference on all of the above items.

PART II

OPENING ADDRESS

By Chairman W. Douglas Mackenzie

Brethren, you will see that the Executive Committee have put down here "Statement by the Chairman" as the next step in the proceedings. As I understand it, their desire was that I should say some few words about the developments of interest that have taken place during the past year in the field of missionary preparation and indicate to our minds afresh something of the meaning and importance of the work that is being undertaken by this Board of Missionary Preparation.

Naturally, the work of such a Board in an entirely new field must at the outset be mainly that of investigation. No such work has been attempted before. You will find to-day from further reports that will be presented to you, not only how uncoördinated has been the work of the boards as from board to board, but how unorganized the work has been within the boards. This field seems latterly to have been, not neglected, but left to be developed along indirect and traditional and sometimes merely occasional lines. What we are first concerned with, therefore, is to find out not only what has been done, but what can be done, and what ought to be done in order to promote the cause of missionary preparation.

On the other hand, we must investigate the matter in relation to the requirements, for the more we investigate the more appalling they seem to become. For those of us who believe most in the need for such work as this Board is appointed to carry out had only a faint conception of what that need is when we first came in contact with it. It seems to grow, it seems to open up as something more complex and far-reaching than any of us had imagined before. We have to find out exactly what varieties of work ought to be undertaken by this Board. And for that end we must find out how in the soil of the board secretaries, and in the sub-soil of the students, we can plant this new seed, and with what chemicals we can treat it so as to bring forth the largest returns. And that work of ours must, therefore, be unostentatious; it cannot show itself in large outer proportions. But it can at the same time be work of the most vital and important sort for the development of the missionary enterprise.

On the home field I should say what we are to do is, first of all, to discover the policy and practice of the various missionary boards and see how we can be of assistance to them, if they need any assistance in the matter. The various educational institutions which have to do with the students that are going abroad as missionaries, men and women alike, will they receive our assistance? Can we really offer them any help that is of value? Can we bring or be the means of

bringing them into closer relations with the boards, and the boards with them? Can we promote a more real and intimate coöperation, so that the result shall be better missionaries both of the ordained and of the unordained or lay classes? And then, ultimately, we shall have to perhaps ask ourselves whether we can do anything for the students; but I think the Executive Committee is clear that that is the most delicate and difficult of all the departments of work that we can attempt to undertake, and that we should concentrate our attention first of all upon the boards and institutions. At present we should be in danger of interfering alike with institutions and with the boards, perhaps in illegitimate and unfortunate ways, if we should undertake direct communication with the student world, so as to influence individuals regarding their courses of study and their methods of preparation. So far as I can see, that must be done only incidentally at present and not as a normal task of this Board.

Now, how is the idea of special missionary preparation getting on? It is only two and a half years since the report which has created this whole movement was presented before the Edinburgh Conference. How in the meantime has that idea been growing? Let me refer to the fact, which some of you may not be intimate with, though practically all are, here, I think, that the Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Conference held its second meeting in this country at Lake Mohonk on September 26th to October 2d; that seventeen out of the twenty-two European members of that committee were actually present; that all of the North American members were present; that one substitute member, without vote, was present from Australia, and that in this way twenty-eight out of thirty-one members of the Board of the Continuation Committee—which, you remember, is international and draws its members from all over the world—twenty-eight out of thirty-one were actually present at Lake Mohonk. That is a very, very significant fact, I think, for the great conception of coöperation which is in the air, and must have tremendous influence upon the whole missionary movement.

The report of that Conference at Lake Mohonk contains two references to the work of missionary preparation, to which you will allow me in a word or two to refer. On page 13 of their brief report they refer to the relation of the Continuation Committee to the Boards of Study, and their resolution or conclusion reads as follows:

> "In view of the fact that the Boards of Study in Great Britain and America, though now independent, owed their origin to the Edinburgh Conference through the Continuation Committee, it appeared advisable that the Continuation Committee should be kept in touch with their work. It was resolved that time should be allowed at meetings of the Continuation Committee to receive brief reports from each Board of Study, and the Boards of Study should be asked to include among their members at least two members of the Continuation Committee with a view to creating a link between their work and that of the Continuation Committee."

That condition is fulfilled already, as I think several of the members of this Board are members of the Continuation Committee.

A report was presented by Dr. Hodgkin, who was with us last year at our first meeting, on the work which he specially is interested in through a committee of the Board in England and a separate corresponding committee on this side. He presented the printed report of a committee on training schools for missionaries on the field. I wish this Board to let me read now the sentence in which he names the special school or attempted and experimental schools which have

arisen within the last few years in various parts of the mission field. He said that

"Correspondence had taken place with the Peking School of Language Study, the Chengtu Language School, the China Inland Mission Training Schools at Nanking and Yangchow, the proposed School for Advanced Study at Shanghai, the Shanghai School of Study in February, 1912, the Tokyo Language School, the Winter School of Language at Lucknow, the proposed Summer School for Women in North India, the proposed School of Languages at Bangalore, the proposed School for Marathi at Poona, and the School of Arabic Study in Cairo."

Now there is a very wonderful growth of young institutions—some of them purely experimental and no doubt going to fade away, but sure to give place to others—a very wonderful growth of such institutions, which are all of them interdenominational, all of them the outcome of a hunger and a demand on the field, all of them a demand for a higher and more efficient mastery of the actual instruments of missionary labor. All of them have sprung up within such a very brief time that their number and their enthusiasm and their interdenominational character, and, as it were, their spontaneity of existence, must be very significant for the work of our Board.

As examples of work on the field here is a report of the Shanghai Union Language School, which met last February, and which enrolled on that occasion, from February 7th to March 1st, no less than 171 missionary students at Shanghai. Of these, 125 took special studies during those weeks in Mandarin and forty-six in the Wu dialects. The result of the school was such and the effect of it was so powerful that they proposed immediately to create a permanent school, and steps were taken towards it. The steps taken have resulted in a bulletin of the University of Nanking, which shows that the University of Nanking is ready to establish a "department of missionary training." That is the title they give to it. They have appointed a dean, and are throwing open their class rooms and some of their dormitories for an experimental year. And they propose to have special buildings and a special organization as a department of the University of Nanking if this year's work should be successful. They propose to have a six months' session, and the daily schedule, they say, will be given to the students at the opening of the term. It will include the study of phonetics, methods of study, idiom and grammar, conversation, etc., a series of lectures on the Chinese language, and lectures on the general training of missionaries as well as some guides in English reading concerning Chinese usages and customs. That plan has no doubt entered upon its experimental stage at Nanking, and our brethren are at work upon it even now.

Elsewhere similar experiments are also being made. At Bangalore in India a school is being started by five missionary societies to teach five of the vernaculars belonging to the region of southern India, including Tamil, Telugu, and so on. The religions of India must be studied. A course of lectures extending over three months will be arranged for, in which Hinduism, Buddhism and Islam will be presented in outline. Some work will be offered in their ancient classics. The probability is that they will also offer lectures on the Dravidian languages, giving attention to phonetics, idioms, structure of sentences, comparative grammar, and such subjects as will enable a student intelligently to begin the study of any of the Dravidian languages.

Further, an experiment is also being made at Poona, where again five societies are engaged in the work, and where they are going to

undertake language instruction and the study of religions. There they propose to prepare students to pass the examinations that are already held, and are being made gradually more severe, by an interdenominational board of missionaries.

To come to the home lands again, the work of our brother board of study in England has made good progress. They have been fortunate to secure the service of Canon Weitbrecht as their secretary or director; and his investigations must bear fruit, for they are energetic and far-reaching, and are carried on with much earnestness and intelligence. They have drawn up a very elaborate bibliography of the literature on Mohammedanism and expect to make that of the utmost value to those who are entering upon that enormous field of study and of special preparation. Last August they held for four weeks a summer school at Oxford. At this school fifty-two students were present, thirty-three men and nineteen women, from all over the world, from ever so many different societies. Ten of them were missionaries on furlough. The program was drawn up very powerfully, and they got first-class men and women to lecture to these students. The result seems to have been very good indeed, and they are beginning to arrange for a similar school to be held at Queen's College, Cambridge, next summer.

What we have attempted will be read before you by our Secretary. We have carefully considered the matter of a director, and he will report results on that. The Executive Committee also engaged in what seems our preliminary task, the opening up of certain investigations, the results of which are before you in these galley proofs of four reports which we ask you to consider to-day.

Brethren, the work grows in significance, and I feel that to-day we ought to have far more encouragement regarding it than we had last year. All over the missionary field, and throughout the life of our home boards, and throughout the institutions that are concerned with the preparation of students, the significance of this matter is much more deeply felt to-day than it was a year ago. The problems become more difficult. Things that seemed easy at first will not seem so easy when we begin actually to undertake them. But I believe no man can come here, however far he has come to this Board meeting, without having the right to feel that he is contributing by his presence and his interest and his work to a movement of very great significance for the kingdom of our Lord. It will grow. The task before us, as I said before, is so entirely new that it must take some time before we begin to see what it really is; but that there is something there, something great to be done, something demanding our time, our devotion and our most intelligent sympathy can be less doubted to-day than at any previous period of our investigations into this matter.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE I

ON PRESENT PLAN AND PRACTICE OF FOREIGN MISSIONARY BOARDS AS TO THE PREPARATION REQUIRED OF THEIR CANDIDATES

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:—Dr. James L. Barton, Chairman; Prof. O. E. Brown, Dr. F. P. Haggard, Mrs. A. F. Schauffler, Dr. T. E. E. Shore, Dr. Robert E. Speer.

PRESENTED BY DR. JAMES L. BARTON, CHAIRMAN

Dr. Barton: It is taken for granted that you all have this report in your hands. I will not read it. I will call attention, however, to a few things that the report has attempted.

We are reaching a third stage in missionary work. The first was endeavor for *territory,* trying to get into the world; the second, for *resources* of men and of money; and now we have come to the third. I think the formation of this Board of Missionary Preparation and a similar Board in Great Britain proclaims the third stage, *"efficiency."* I doubt if we have hitherto put the emphasis upon efficiency that the subject demanded. This Board itself, created by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, indicates a feeling on the part of missionary societies that there is a necessity at the present time for increasing efficiency. It is the cry of business, it is the cry of organizations, and it has become the cry of the missionary societies.

Everybody will agree, I have no question, that the strength of missionary work abroad depends under God upon the efficiency of the missionary force. It is not dependent upon numbers, it is not dependent upon the money that the missionary societies have, but it is dependent upon the efficiency of the missionary force put into the field; and I think without question we would all agree that a small—but efficient—missionary force will be far more effective in the volume and permanency of the work accomplished, than a much larger but inefficient missionary force, and be much less expensive. That apparently is the ground upon which we can all start and upon which the missionary boards agree.

We come now to the investigation of this Committee on the "Plan and Practice of Foreign Missionary Boards as to the Preparation Required of their Candidates." The Committee covered in its investigation four distinct points. First, as to what the requirements are on the part of the various missionary societies; second, as to the means available for the securing of those requirements in candidates; third, as to what the boards themselves are doing in the matter of the preparation of their candidates; and, fourth, as to what this Board of Studies should do in aiding missionary societies and securing better equipment of their missionary bodies. Those were covered in a questionaire that was sent out. The replies received came from the missionary societies representing at least five-sixths of the missionary

work of North America, and from the leading secretaries in those societies, so that it seems to me that we may regard the replies as being generally complete and representing on the whole the judgment of the missionary societies in North America.

We found in the investigation that missionary boards are conscious of the need of better equipment in their missionaries. The secretaries, almost without exception, declare that the equipment of their candidates is not equal to the requirements. For the Board, which I represent, I can say that we spend a great deal of time in trying to fit candidates into places where their equipment will enable them to render the most effective service. I was a long time yesterday trying to fit into a place a man who for seven years, we now learn, has been regarding himself as a missionary candidate. He has offered himself now. He has made no attempt at special preparation for the work, and we are trying to find a place in which the candidate, a most worthy man, can use his talent and his unbalanced equipment to the highest advantage for the work; I have no doubt that every secretary here will acknowledge that much time is spent in trying to find a place for a candidate rather than a workman for a task. We are not out looking for men to do a certain thing, but we are trying to fit men whom we have found to do a certain work. It is much like a person setting out to erect a great structure, who first goes out and finds columns, pillars, doorposts and steel beams and all that, and assembles them; and then he studies the kind of building he can erect out of the material he has gathered together, instead of starting out with a plan for the building and securing the columns and beams and the doorposts and the material that the building is going to require in order to be complete and effective and accomplish the object of its construction. In looking over the information received from missionary societies it seems to me that the officers of these societies are conscious of the fact that they have been trying to make the most possible out of the material that has come to them.

Pardon a reference to my own case. When I went into the mission field in the Turkish Empire I never had a word said to me by the missionary society in regard to my preparation—not a word. I had never heard a lecture or read a book on Mohammedanism, and I was sent to Turkey. I knew nothing of missionary work in Turkey except as I hunted for and found some books on Turkey after I had been appointed. And I think that if we should investigate the missionaries that went out up to ten or fifteen years ago, we should find that, apart from the work of the Student Volunteer Movement, as far as the mission board was concerned they had received no equipment for their work and but little suggestion except as they asked for it from the missionary societies as to what equipment was required for the work in the field. So, for the first point, the societies are agreed that the equipment is inadequate.

They are also agreed that the institutions from which their candidates come are not providing these candidates with the equipment which they themselves require in their candidates for the accomplishment of the work they are appointed to undertake. There seems to be one universal testimony to that end, as you will find detailed in the report.

The third point, the question as to what the boards are doing, has already been referred to in part. It is an astonishing fact that the missionary societies of North America, which, I believe, according to the revised figures, use perhaps twenty millions of dollars a year in their

work, are doing *practically nothing* to equip the men and women whom they send out for the work to which they are appointed, although they are conscious of the fact that the success of that work depends primarily upon the efficiency of the force they appoint to the service. Not a missionary society is systematically doing anything for the equipment of its missionary body.

In our own Board—and I want to make a confession at the same time that I make this statement—in our own Board a few years ago it was almost heresy to attempt to do anything to prepare a candidate for his work. It was expected that the men and women who applied would be led under the providence of God to apply, and it was regarded as unorthodox to go out and seek men and women for particular places. Now that is within my memory; that is, within a decade.

And much less do these boards do anything to prepare these men and women for the service. Over and over again in answer to the question, "Has your board any policy as to aiding candidates in their preparation for the missionary service under your board?" the reply, "We have no policy whatever; we advise candidates when they seek advice." Almost the universal statement given is, "We advise when they seek advice." And if the advice was as efficient as some that the candidates applying to the American Board got from its secretaries, who themselves have given no great attention to this subject, it was most inadequate for preparation for a life work under the board. So that we can put down as the policy of the missionary societies as demonstrated by these replies that have come up to the present hour that there is no policy with reference to the equipment and preparation of missionary candidates under the boards.

I need not longer dwell upon this point. It is a fact that confronts us, and it is a fact showing the tremendous importance of having the Board of Missionary Preparation to do this first work with and for the missionary societies: to learn what their requirements are and to secure their coöperation with this Board in an effort to produce better trained candidates for the service to which they are appointed.

The question was asked as to how this Board of Missionary Preparation can best aid the missionary societies. I will not dwell upon that, but there was one universal reply, expressing great satisfaction that the Board had been created and a great expectation that the Board would be of continuous and effective service to the secretaries and to the missionary societies in the training of their own candidates for the work for which they are to be appointed. I think we can depend upon this Board receiving the hearty and cordial coöperation of the missionary societies of North America in its endeavor, first, to bring the societies up to a high conception of the importance of an adequate preparation for the work to be done, and then to put into their hands means by which they can best secure the equipment in their candidates that they require for the work. That is very clear. That means that this Board's first endeavor, as it seems to me from these returns, is to establish a standard. Now that does not mean a wooden, formal standard, but a standard in the minds of the officers of the missionary societies of America, and a standard which students and the prospective candidates will at once recognize, and to which they will conform their own preparation—a standard which the schools in which missionary candidates are trained will recognize and to which they will adapt their curricula. The schools and missionary boards together can work to increase the efficiency of the missionary force.

I realize that there is a danger in this ideal. It is said that a busi-

ness firm in Boston so caught the idea of efficiency in business management that it had developed the most beautiful and most complete systems of cross-references and card catalogues that probably has ever been introduced into any establishment. The head of the firm was showing a friend how everything could be shown at a glance, just how the business stood. In response to a question he acknowledged that since they had established this system they had had no time to do business, but were using their whole force to maintaining the system. That is one of the dangers missionary societies and this Board must avoid. We must not put all our time and strength into producing efficiency to the neglect of the work abroad.

THE REPORT

A series of questions was prepared and sent, under date of February 28, 1912, to the secretaries of thirty-one of the leading missionary societies in North America, including all of the larger societies, accompanied by a personal letter of explanation. Under date of May 11, another set of inquiries, supplementing the first list, was sent to the same societies.

Without going into all the details of the questionaires, the first set called for information as to

I—The intellectual qualifications required by the Board in those whom it appoints for missionary service abroad.

II—Whether the existing and available schools are providing the instruction and training their missionary candidates should have for their most successful work abroad.

III—Specific deficiencies noticed in candidates with reference to their intellectual preparation.

IV—Whether those who have not had a full theological course should have a more systematic and thorough training in Biblical studies, Christian Doctrine and Evidences and Church History.

V—Whether or not languages to be used on the field should be attempted before sailing.

VI—As to how the Board of Missionary Studies can best serve the missionary societies at home and the work abroad:

By attempting to procure in leading colleges and theological seminaries new and more complete courses of study in

(1) History and Principles of Education.
(2) History and Content of the Great Non-Christian Religions.
(3) Philosophy of Religion.
(4) History of Modern Missions.
(5) Theory and Practice of Modern Missions.
(6) History of Leading Missionary Societies.
(7) History of Progress of Missions in the Countries for which the Candidates are Preparing.
(8) Study of Tropical Conditions and Medicine for Physicians Going to the Tropics.
(9) More Thorough Knowledge of the Bible.
(10) Christian Doctrine and Evidences.
(11) Phonetics.

By informing the Boards, for the uses of their candidates, returned missionaries, etc., where, and under what terms these studies can be pursued, and

By the preparation and publication of a select and carefully chosen list of the best and most recent books and articles upon subjects like the following:

(1) On each of the Great Religions of the World.
(2) On each of the Missionary Countries of the World.
(3) On Education and Allied Topics.
(4) On the Theory and Practice of Missions.
(5) On Christian Doctrine and Evidences.
(6) On other subjects that will be of general interest to officers of Boards, candidates and missionaries.

It was stated in conclusion that the questions were asked in order to ascertain whether there was a conscious need of a better training for missionary candidates to prepare them best to meet the increasing demands made upon them in every missionary country, and whether in some or all of the ways suggested the Board of Missionary Studies may be of real service to the secretaries, their candidates and the Board.

The second inquiry was briefer and raised only three leading questions:

I—Whether the Board addressed had a definite policy with reference to the supervision of the training of those who are prospective candidates for appointment.

II—Whether any aid to candidates and newly-appointed missionaries is given to assist in meeting their expense of preparation before taking up work in the mission, and

III—Willingness to coöperate, at important centers where missionaries of different societies are using a common language, with other missions and societies in maintaining a practical and scientific school for training newly-appointed missionaries in the vernacular.

Replies were received from twenty-five of the Boards addressed, including the leading organizations representing the great bulk of all the missionary interests in North America. Many of the responses were full, and covered the subject with great care and thoroughness.

One of the most striking features of this entire line of investigation is the unanimity of the answers given in every instance by experienced secretaries, or officially by responsible committees to which the matter had been referred. The fact of this general agreement upon existing conditions and needs renders unnecessary a full and detailed report upon individual replies or any attempt at tabulating the same.

Upon the subject of the intellectual qualifications required of candidates, some Boards put more emphasis upon a complete college and seminary course than do others. When all phases and classes of work are considered, embracing all the modern departmental features and including work for women and girls as well as that for boys and men, almost every order of equipment is required.

For Ordained Candidates: For the ordained service there is a general agreement that the candidates should be graduates in Arts, followed by a theological course not inferior to that demanded for ordination in the home land.

For Medical Candidates: Nearly all Boards prefer candidates who have taken the Arts course before completing a full medical course in a reputable medical college, followed by one or even two years of hospital experience. Some Boards require, in addition, a certificate to practice medicine in some state in this country, and, in case of future location in a tropical country, a full course in tropical medicine. No Board as yet insists that all its medical missionaries shall have secured the B.A. degree.

For Teachers: For those appointed for specific teaching positions the requirements vary much in the practice of the various Boards. A new emphasis is now being placed upon normal and pedagogical training for both men and women. Some Boards strongly recommend courses in pedagogy for both men and women who plan to go out as general missionaries.

For Wives: There is no distinctive intellectual standard for wives; and yet here, also, there is a generally expressed desire that wives should have some special training in every instance before going to their field. In a great many cases the wives have full college courses. This is welcomed and encouraged.

It goes without saying that all Boards consider the quality of the

mental equipment, as well as character and quantity of preparation. It is impossible even for a single Board to state in abstract terms the intellectual qualifications it demands in its candidates before they can be appointed, and much less can this be done for the twenty-five Boards from which answers were received. It can, however, be stated in a word that it is manifest that all Boards seek for the highest grade of intellectual excellence in all of their candidates for appointment—but are compelled to accept many who fall short of their standard. The following replies will throw much light upon this first subject.

With reference to the adequacy of the available schools for training missionary candidates, the replies were quite complete. Out of the entire number of replies only one correspondent seemed to consider the training of the candidates appointed as adequate for the service they were to render, but this society is small and carries on work only in Latin America. One other reply was ambiguous, while all of the rest were emphatic in the declaration of the conviction that the existing facilities for training missionaries are inadequate and unsatisfactory.

In order that the judgment thus expressed may be understood, we quote from some of the replies, which in each case represents the opinion of an experienced secretary of a leading missionary society:

"I think I may safely say that our Board is not satisfied that the schools now available are giving the young men and women, by way of instruction and training, all that they need for their most successful work abroad."

"I know of no school that is giving the training demanded in order to do successful work."

"I am quite sure that our ordained ministers, teachers and single women are not receiving the best training possible for their missionary life work. Our theological courses are not prescribed with a view to providing adequate training for missionaries."

"Our schools and colleges still lack important lines of training for our appointees to the mission field."

"My estimate of the preparatory work in the schools now available would be that they are all lacking in courses which look distinctly to the foreign service. It is peculiarly true that our seminaries have not as yet adequately provided for missionary preparation. This cannot be done through occasional lectures in the regular course."

"I do not believe that the training (for missionary service) has been along scientific lines as in other special fields."

"I do not think we can say that we are satisfied with the instruction and training given to our missionaries. The ordained men have very little of special preparation in regard to the religious positions of the people to whom they are going, and practically no training as to the corresponding Christian truth which would be most effectively presented. Many enter educational work without special training."

"We are convinced that the existing schools for training missionary candidates are not adequate."

"There are no schools or colleges in North America which provide the young men whom we wish to send out with all the instruction and training we believe they need for the accomplishment of the difficult mission on which we send them."

"From the point of view of our Board and the men and women who are planning to go out, we feel that the curricula of our schools are not as they should be. There should be more opportunity for instruction in special branches."

"The present training of missionaries is not entirely satisfactory. Present preparation hardly gives all that is really needed."

"Existing and available schools are not satisfactorily providing the instruction and training our candidates should have for their most successful work abroad."

These quotations are, in some cases, condensed and the details excluded. The twelve societies whose position upon this question is, we believe, fairly represented in these quotations, are supporting, upon the

foreign field, over three-fourths of all of the American missionaries. We have a right to assume that the judgment here expressed represents practically the opinion of the officers and members of the missionary societies of North America.

To the third question, in reference to recognized deficiencies in the intellectual equipment of candidates, there is also a full and illuminating series of replies. Space will not permit extended quotations from all of these replies, but it is possible to do justice to them by classification. The most of the writers express themselves as strongly convinced that there should be more adequate instruction given to missionary candidates in the following subjects:

(1) Pedagogy.
(2) Comparative Religions.
(3) History and Philosophy of Religion.
(4) Study in detail of the Religion or Religions of the people to whom they go.
(5) History and Characteristics of the people to whom they go.
(6) History of the missionary movement among those people.
(7) History and Methods of Foreign Missions and other allied topics.
(8) The Bible.

Several put especial emphasis upon the importance of Pedagogy. One is opposed to the study of Comparative Religions and the History and Philosophy of Religion, while two believe that topics like the study of the religions of a people and their characteristics, etc., can most profitably be studied after arrival in the country.

It is difficult to reveal adequately the unanimity in expression, as well as emphasis, with which these missionary leaders treat this subject without quoting in extenso their own declarations. These replies but show some of the reasons for the position taken upon the first question.

Suggestions were also made of the need of instruction in the methods of acquiring a language, business courses, book-keeping, etc.

The fourth question—as to whether those who have not taken a full theological course should have a more systematic and thorough training in Biblical Studies, Christian Doctrine and Evidences and Church History—meets with general unanimity. Some put special emphasis upon the need of facilities for such study open to the single women missionaries. One or two raised the question as to whether missionary physicians would be willing to delay their departure to the field for the purpose of taking such a course, although it was recognized that the course would be most desirable. Some expressed regret that more emphasis is not placed upon these courses in our existing theological seminaries, while others mention special endeavors now being made to emphasize anew these lines of study for ministers at home as well as for missionaries.

A conviction of the importance of unusual emphasis upon these courses in the preparation of all missionary candidates is clearly indicated in the answers received. In fact, the position is made clear that no candidate, who has not had extended instruction, and who has not pursued thorough courses in these departments, can be regarded as equipped for the foreign service. In whatever capacity they enter the foreign service, whether as physicians, teachers, printers, business managers, industrial workers or preachers, they stand, in the eyes of the people of the countries to whom they go, as "teachers of Christianity." From this they cannot escape; and, if they are worthy the service to which they have been sent, they ought not to escape. In order to fulfill

this rôle with credit to the cause they serve an adequate training in the fundamentals of the religion they represent and perforce *must* teach is imperatively essential.

The subject of the study of the vernacular to be used in the field by the candidate before going out called forth a large number of replies, almost wholly in the negative. The consensus of opinion was that the languages used in the mission field can best be studied by the candidates on the field, after having received instruction in the general work affecting the principles and science of phonetics and linguistic requirements in general. A few declared that their experiences had not yet been sufficiently extended to enable them to answer the question intelligently. One secretary, while expressing his conviction that no attempt should be made to study in this country the language of the field, is convinced that every missionary should be acquainted with at least one modern language in addition to his own.

The suggestion is made in general that Spanish might profitably be studied here by those going to Latin countries, and that an Arabic or Sanscrit foundation might be of service to one contemplating work in Turkey or India. One who recently visited the Oriental Seminary in Berlin and the Colonial Institute in Hamburg, where eastern languages are taught with scientific skill and accuracy, states that he is persuaded that, were such scientific facilities for the study of the languages used in mission fields available for missionary candidates, it would be wise to employ them. He is convinced that the science of the study of the languages can best be taught in the home field.

Many of the secretaries replying to this question have themselves served as missionaries, and these all express the conviction that the practical study of the vernacular of all mission fields can best be pursued after the field is reached. This, however, approaches another question considered later in this report and which is already in process of solution in some language centers in mission countries—namely, the maintenance of interdenominational, scientific language schools to which new missionaries shall be sent, and in which the vernacular of that region shall be taught with phonetical and scientific precision. If the development of such schools can be accomplished, all will probably agree that this will be the best solution of the vernacular study question. This will insure scientific accuracy in the country where the candidate can train his tongue and his ear while he is studying the country, the people and the work in all phases and departments.

In order to get at the points under consideration more practically and to secure the judgment of the leading secretaries of the missionary societies of this country as to the points in which the Board of Missionary Preparation can best serve these societies, the question was asked as to whether they would favor an endeavor on the part of the Board to have introduced into the leading colleges and seminaries in this country various branches which are recorded earlier in this report and which need not be repeated.

The twelve topics to which reference has just been made are, with few exceptions, accepted by our correspondents. The most of them express their approval of these topics without comment, although one would eliminate the Philosophy of Religion, Comparative Religions and the History and Content of the Great Non-Christian Religions. One, in sending his reply, says that larger emphasis upon each of these subjects under consideration is urgently needed in all our schools of advanced learning. Another, in giving hearty assent to the list, states that if he were to pick out any among the important

topics for special study it would be the History of Pedagogy, History and Content of the Great Non-Christian Religions, Theory and Practice of Modern Missions, Tropical Conditions and Medicine, with special emphasis upon the Bible. Another correspondent, while approving of the studies as suggested, finds difficulty in the practical method by which they can be brought about. But as the practical side is not a part of the inquiry, that can be passed over in this report. Another, in replying, says:

"Most emphatically would it help our work if the topics suggested could be encouraged and carried out in influencing American and Canadian colleges and theological seminaries to establish and develop complete courses of study in all of the twelve subjects mentioned."

Another, and the last from which we quote, says:

"It would be of great advantage to have the list of subjects named taught in our various colleges where candidates prepare for the foreign field."

The answers make it clear that, in the minds of the leading secretaries of the principal missionary societies of this country, there is a conscious lack of proper training in these twelve topics at least.

There is no need of giving extended space to the replies which came as to whether it would be helpful for secretaries of the societies to know where these topics can best be pursued. There was only one reply, and that was in the expression of a desire for such information. This is desired on the part of the secretaries, not only for the secretaries themselves, but for their candidates, and to help them in writing their candidates of places where they can best complete their preparation. The same information is desired for the use of missionaries upon furlough. The conclusion of the inquiry is this: when the Board of Missionary Studies has investigated facilities offered in the different preparatory institutions for training missionary candidates, the Boards themselves will wish to receive the information obtained by the Board of Studies.

The last question asked in the first set of inquiries is as to whether the secretaries would favor the publication from time to time of a selected and carefully chosen list of the best and most recent books and articles upon those different topics named on the second page of this report. The replies to this question are as unanimous and emphatic as to those of the question preceding. One secretary said:

"We have been greatly handicapped by not having a selected list of books on the subjects referred to. I hope the Board of Missionary Studies will supply something more specific than a general catalogue of the books on these subjects. If the recommendation of the Board of Missionary Studies is to be of real value it must be discriminating and must give priority to the books which have chief value for the purposes indicated."

Another:

"It would be of decided advantage to us to have such a list of books as is indicated under this head. I feel certain, also, that we could make it of special profit to our missionaries."

Another secretary of a large Board, in expressing his hearty approval of such a list, makes added suggestion that

"The Board of Missionary Studies could do a most helpful piece of work along the line of planning out the curricula for the preparation of the various kinds of missionary service and also study books covering this curricula."

Another secretary writes:

"The preparation of the Bibliography suggested is one of the most vital services that the Board of Missionary Studies can render to the cause."

Another:

"For years we have felt the need of such lists, not only for use with new candidates but with our workers home on furlough."

Also:

"It would be of great help to receive such carefully considered recommendations and books especially on such topics as the Great Religions of the World, History of Missionary Countries, Education, Pedagogy, etc., Theory and Practice of Missions, and such other missionary subjects as would be of interest to the missionary boards and societies."

Perhaps the answers to this question are the most enthusiastic and unanimous of any received, making it evident that the secretaries of all the Boards with whom we corresponded are now conscious of their need of the help that the Board of Missionary Studies can render along this line.

In order to obtain a clear understanding as to what the various missionary boards of North America are doing in the way of preparing candidates for their special service or of supervising them during the period of preparation, a supplemental set of questions was sent out bearing upon this point. The first one of these questions was:

"Has your Board a definite policy with reference to the supervision of the training of those who are prospective candidates for appointment?"

This was followed by a question as to whether financial aid was given the candidates in selecting and pursuing their courses of study, and as to whether they were financially assisted in so doing.

The answers to this question have been very general and complete. In order to make the situation perfectly clear, it seems necessary to quote from several of these replies. Those from whom quotations are made are secretaries of the leading missionary societies of the country. They are as follows:

"Our Board has no definite policy with reference to the supervision of the training of those who are prospective candidates for appointment unless an absence of all participation in such supervision constitutes a policy. We have not in the past regularly and systematically assisted prospective candidates in selecting and pursuing their courses of study or in aiding them financially. The Secretaries of the Board and others have personally rendered assistance in both directions; but this has never become a definite policy of the Board."

"We have no special arrangements for the training of missionary candidates and no plan for aiding them in their course of preparation, except as we have a fund aiding candidates for the ministry who study in our regular seminaries."

"Our society has no definite policy with reference to the supervision of the training of those who are prospective candidates for appointment. Our society gives advice to candidates when they ask for it, but it does not systematically assist those who are expecting to go to the field, nor does it aid them financially. The work of training is left to the colleges."

"Our Board has no definite policy for the supervision of the training of those who are prospective candidates. When they appeal to us individually for help we endeavor to advise them according to their particular need in their future work. Neither do we aid them financially. A Board of Education has been established by our church to give aid to ordained and medical men preparing for missionary service."

"Our Board has no definite policy with reference to the supervision of candidates. We seldom volunteer any suggestions as to studies or courses to be pursued, and never except as individuals. No courses of special studies for

different countries have ever been considered by our Board, much less a general course of preparation for service under the Board. It has been our time-honored policy to accept and appoint such candidates as offer themselves for service after they have creditably completed a course of study in a recognized college, theological seminary or medical school. It can be said that our Board has exerted no special effort in directing candidates to a course of training for their life work as missionaries. They have been left to themselves to select and pursue such courses of study as they chose. Neither has any financial aid been given."

"Our Board chooses its applicants from theological seminaries and training schools, giving them no aid in their preparation for study and accepting them with such training as they receive."

Another Board says:

"We leave the supervision of the training of volunteers who expect to be ordained to the authorities of the seminary where they are taking their course. We occasionally endeavor to suggest lines of missionary reading for them but do not go beyond that. Practically the same arrangement applies to the young women who are being trained in the Deaconess' schools."

"It has not been the policy of our Board to take any supervision of the training of candidates. and we invariably decline to assist them while pursuing preparatory study."

Another Board secretary reports:

"We have a missionary training school for the purpose of training men and women for home and foreign service where aid is given in selecting and pursuing their courses of study and preparation for the foreign field, and where a great many of the candidates are aided by scholarships."

In addition to those from whom quotations have already been made, twelve secretaries report "no policy" with reference to aiding students and prospective candidates in their preparation for service, except as a few of them say:

"We render advice when such is asked for by a prospective candidate."

There is only one conclusion to which this investigation inevitably leads, and that is, that hitherto it has been, and is at the present time, the general policy of the missionary societies of North America to begin their official and even advisory relations to prospective candidates only after they have been appointed, which, in most instances, occurs but a brief time before their sailing for the field; that these candidates secure whatever advice they are able to secure anywhere and everywhere, and pursue such courses of study as seem wise to them without any special relations to the Board under which they expect to go out, or to the work which they expect to do after reaching the foreign field. Some of the correspondents seem to realize the weakness of their position with reference to the training of candidates, and expressed their hope and expectation that the Board of Missionary Preparation will render them substantial help in the future in securing better equipped men and women for the missionary service.

The second question related to financial help rendered to candidates while completing their theological course, or making special preparation in pedagagy, medicine or other studies, or while engaged in language study. The general and practically universal reply was in the negative, except what is already indicated in this report. The missionary candidates in preparation in theological schools are eligible to the same aid as those studying for the Christian ministry at home. There has been and is no provision reported for aiding candidates for studying the vernacular of the country to which they go before going

out. In the case of one Board at least, where a course in tropical medicine is required of all medical missionaries going to tropical countries, the Board assumes the expense of that course, which is taken in England and covers a period of three months. The Board pays the tuition and the living expenses of the candidate while pursuing the course. Another Board continues the missionary salary during the time occupied in the Tropical Medicine Course.

Also in the case of missionary physicians going to the Turkish Empire one Board meets the expense of such appointees who, if not familiar with the French language, are compelled by the law of Turkey to stop in France and perfect themselves in the French medical language, so as to pass the license examinations at Constantinople. The expense for this delay in France for the purpose named, as also the expense for the examination in Constantinople, is defrayed by the Board. A leading Board has adopted the policy of having its missionaries in Portuguese Africa stop in Lisbon for several months for the study of Portuguese before reaching their country. This Board meets all expenses of such delay and study.

The last question asked was not, perhaps, so relevant as the preceding; it was as to whether the Board replying would be willing at important centers where missionaries of different societies are using a common language, to unite with other missions in sustaining a practical and scientific school for training newly appointed missionaries in the vernacular. There was almost a general expression of approval of such a plan and a willingness to coöperate. Reference was frequently made to the plans already adopted and entered upon in Japan, China and India. One Board reports "summer schools for the study of the language," but the secretary states that he thinks their Board would be willing to abandon the special summer school in favor of a more general scientific school in which various missions united. Others speak of their realization of the importance of the organization of such schools in order to secure for the new missionaries a more systematic and careful study and a more practical drill in the language they are to use in their missionary service. Some suggest that, in addition to the study of the language, the customs and manners of the people, etc., be added. Others speak of their belief that the advantages of such schools should be left to the judgment of the missionaries on the field, and that any decision by the Boards in favor should be made after the missionaries have been consulted.

In the replies, reservations were made as to the location of such a school, its management, etc.; but the replies are clear that there exists a consciousness, on the part of many of the leading secretaries of the leading missionary societies, that better facilities need to be offered to the new missionary on the field in acquiring a mastery of the vernacular. There is a recognition of the fact that many able missionaries render only a partial service during their whole life, owing to their weakness in the language, and in most cases (if not all) because of their failure to learn the vernacular during the first three years of their missionary life. It goes without saying that if several societies unite together in giving such services to the new missionary appointees they will be able to secure better advantages than is possible for any individual society to do alone—and that, too, with much less individual expense. There is no doubt that the missionary societies of North America are ready to consider this question fairly and impartially.

Your Committee does not understand that its commission included the formulation of any conclusions or the presentation of recommenda-

tions. We were appointed with instructions to ascertain a certain number of facts and opinions bearing upon the subject of the Preparation of Missionary Candidates and the service which, in the judgment of officers of the missionary societies, the Board of Missionary Preparation may best render the Boards.

These facts and opinions, as secured by your Committee, are herewith presented.

THE DISCUSSION

Dr. Charles R. Watson: First of all, let me express my deep appreciation of the material which has been brought together so splendidly by the Committee. It falls to me to discuss this report from the point of view of a Board Secretary.

The Committee's report indicates a somewhat chaotic condition, a somewhat deplorable absence of clear requirements on the part of the Missionary Boards, and a lack of uniformity among the boards, even where requirements are definitely reported. I think I ought to say in explanation of this situation, but without intending to justify its continuance, that three reasons may be discovered for the existing situation. First, it has been impossible for many boards to departmentalize the work which has to do with the selection and the training of candidates. We do well at this point to recognize what ought to be recognized in all discussions of Board administration, that there is a very marked difference between the larger boards and the smaller boards in the matter of establishing separate departments for the several divisions of work. It may be possible for a large board to create a separate department and commit to it certain lines of work, where a smaller board, owing to its more limited work and its more limited resources, cannot create such separate departments. However, in but few boards do we find a separate department organized, claiming the time and attention of a specially designated secretary whose task it is to cultivate the interest and direct the training of those who are presenting themselves for foreign missionary appointment. And because we have not had these distinct departments, there have not been worked out any clear rules or system for dealing with missionary candidates.

A second reason for the chaotic condition referred to lies in the fact that the conditions with which we are dealing have to be taken as they are. We are dealing not with a theory, but with facts. It might be ideal to have missionary candidates fulfilling certain requirements and set free to undertake certain courses of training, but in the great majority of cases the material has to be used which presents itself for missionary purposes, and conditions entirely prevent the candidate taking up special training. It is to be recognized that while we are endeavoring to improve the machinery of the missionary enterprise, we cannot afford to entirely stop missionary operations while we attempt to build up a new machine. The activities of our work must be kept moving, and it has not been possible to do much in the direction of working out suitable theories for missionary qualifications when time and strength were preoccupied with the claims of existing work.

But a third reason for the chaotic condition may be honestly admitted to be the lack on the part of board secretaries and others of an adequate application of thought and study to the subject before us. We do not know what the requirements should be, nor how to attain to the true requirements for missionary service, simply because we have not given thought and study to this question. It will be good to make

this honest confession on behalf of Mission Boards and Board Secretaries, because we do not have to admit for a moment that we are facing an insuperable difficulty. If we only proceed along normal and natural lines, we can arrive at the discovery of standards and methods relating to missionary training.

In studying the report of the Committee from the point of view of a Board Secretary, one has certain definite impressions made upon his mind, and to these I would refer in order:

1. It is quite clear that as yet no adequate solution has been offered to the question, Where and how shall the missionary candidate get his special training for missionary service? Three courses suggest themselves: (*a*) Should we change existing courses in the regular training schools or theological seminaries? I have in mind here especially the ordained missionaries; these, after all, constitute the backbone of the missionary force, and we do well to give them our first thought. Would it be wise to give these a training so specialized that they would follow courses altogether separate from those followed by the candidate for a home pastorate? Or should we even cause him to go to a separate school for his training? I think as a secretary I would be loath to see this done. That some of the subjects studied by a man who is purposing to spend his life in America might well be omitted by the prospective missionary, may easily be admitted. But the differences between the courses taken by the man who goes abroad and the courses taken by the man who stays at home must not be made so great as to have these two men lose their point of contact, their sense of fellowship in the same ministry. We know that the fellowships of the Theological Seminary, in which men have been equally trained for the home pastorate and for the foreign field, constitute one of the strongest bonds, helping forward the missionary enterprise and securing for it an adequate support of sympathy, prayer and financial help at the home base. The advantage which we now possess at this point must be safeguarded.

We venture to suggest that it might be well to inquire whether the criticisms of the ordinary theological course as related to the training of the ordained foreign missionary, are not criticisms which reach much further than we think. Might it not be that the seminaries have been characterized as somewhat inadequate in their training of the foreign missionary, not because a special and peculiar training is required for the foreign field, but because the theological training as it now exists has in it elements that are not at all adapted for an aggressive, spiritual ministry, either at home or abroad?

(*b*) Another method that may be followed in securing special training for prospective missionaries is to add special courses or years of study after a regular theological course has been completed. To express the feelings of a Board Secretary, we do well to recognize the immense pressure that is laid upon the boards to send out at once a young candidate. The needs of the field are overwhelming. Death and illness are constantly making ravages upon the force on the field. The gaps must be filled and advance cannot be postponed. There is every temptation to waive a year of special training and send out the missionary at once. From the point of view of the missionary candidate also, the lack of provision for a special year of study and the desire to get married and settled in his life work, make him impatient to postpone his sailing for a year, that he may get special training.

(*c*) A third method may be suggested. It is that during the summer the missionary candidate attend special schools in which he will

receive special training for the foreign field. Some have disapproved of this plan. In the presence of our great ideals for a thorough training, such provision seems to be wholly unworthy. Nevertheless, it impresses me as one method that might be put into operation at once, and it would be infinitely better than nothing. There would be no reason for limiting such training during the summer to the last summer which the missionary candidate has in this country. On the contrary, he might be led to get such training during several summers previous to his sailing. The summer vacations of our students are quite extended, affording three and even four months of time. In such institutions as the University of Chicago, and state institutions generally, summer quarters are now being planned and the schools are largely attended during this quarter by teachers and others whose life work claims the bulk of the year. Training during the summer may thus be made a strong factor in increasing the efficiency of those who are in service or those who are still pursuing regular studies in other schools during the bulk of the year.

2. A second impression gathered from studying this report has to do with the content of our ideals in the matter of special missionary training. What sort of training is it that we wish prospective missionaries to have? The Committee has consulted the Boards and Board Secretaries, and has brought in many suggestions. Would it not be well to ask this question of the missionaries who are in service? I have heard of a business school that proposed to get up commercial courses on a thoroughly scientific basis. Instead of theorizing about what sort of training might be necessary for a good business man, circulars were sent out to a number of successful business men, and they were asked to indicate what factors in their training, when they were in school, had been found to be most serviceable in the actual exprience of business life. The returns were said to be very suggestive of how much useless material was being carried in the ordinary commercial course and what inadequate emphasis was being laid on some extremely vital points. In a similar fashion, therefore, I would suggest that successful missionaries be asked to indicate the special lines of training which they have found to be most serviceable in the actual experiences of missionary work.

As one reads the list of subjects which it is proposed to study, there comes a feeling so strong that it almost amounts to a revulsion of feeling against things which minister solely to technical knowledge. All the subjects mentioned in the Committee's report ought undoubtedly to be made a part of the curriculum to be followed by a prospective missionary. But as a Secretary, I must confess to a deeper need. It is something which will help to develop personality and leadership; something which will foster devotion and zeal. Or must we say that these qualities are wholly uncommunicable? Is there nothing in the way of training or environment, which may be part of the special course of a missionary, which will lay emphasis on these qualities, which, after all, mean so much on the foreign field? I would earnestly put in a plea for a consideration of this question. The development indicated may not be attained by the study of text books, but yet it might be attained by reading or lectures or fellowships which would lift before the missionary candidate the vision of the vital place which the impact of personality has in a successful missionary career.

(3) The report discusses also the question of securing aid for the student who wishes to pursue the special studies. There is, indeed, some difficulty at this point, but the difficulty is not great. It may be

that the Board of Foreign Missions is not the agency to render this aid. It may be that this would be the duty of a Board of Education, but from some source the necessary aid could be secured. No investment of money would be more effective than this. I need not dwell on this point, because I think it can be safely assumed that if we shall lift a clear vision of the kind of training that is necessary and provide the institutions where such a training can be secured, it will be a small matter to provide for the support of missionary candidates during the year or two given to special missionary training.

(4) In conclusion, I would lay emphasis on a few things which it would seem could be done and could be done at once: (*a*) There is urgent need for the list of books referred to in the Committee's report, such a list as can be recommended to students who wish to read up or study along special lines. I would only lay great emphasis on the word of caution uttered by some Secretary who urged that this list "must be discriminating and must give priority to the books which have chief value for the purpose indicated." Too extended a list without adequate explanations of the special values of certain books becomes simply a ground of discouragement.

(*b*) We are also in need of a list of schools where special missionary training is now available, and the courses that can be secured in the same. It is conceivable that each board secretary could write for himself and get on the track of places where such training can be secured; but this is a service that a central committee could render for all. This information would need to be tabulated first of all geographically, so that instant reference could be made to institutions within certain geographical areas, thus avoiding the necessity of recommending an institution that is quite remote from the place of residence of the missionary candidate. Then the list should be made out topically, according to the kind of special training which is being sought.

(*c*) Finally, there should be brought together full and definite information as to the methods actually used by boards that have taken the lead in these matters. There is nothing so persuasive as a clear picture of what is actually being done by some established missionary agency. At this point the "big boards" may well assume a sense of real responsibility. Their size, their administrative resources, their financial strength, permit them to organize candidate departments. If they will organize a "Big Brother" movement in this matter, they may blaze the way for smaller boards, who will do what they can, although they may not be able to carry so specialized a form of work in following up candidates and in securing for them special training for missionary service.

Rev. T. E. Edgerton Shore: One of the most important questions in connection with the work from the standpoint of the mission boards, I think, is that of the productive value of the missionary. Having in mind the immensity of our task, the field to be cultivated, the mass to be evangelized and, together with that, our limited resources, how can we make the most of what we have? How can we accomplish the task with the resources that are available? I tihnk that is preeminently a question which, theoretically at least, occupies the administrative mind of the mission board.

I have a friend, a Japanese preacher, who spent some years in postgraduate studies in Canada, who said to me before returning to Japan: "I wish that I could devote sixty years to preparation, and then five years to putting that prepartion into its effect in Japan." I do not think that that represented merely the love of an academic life or of intel-

lectual indulgence. I believe it represents to some extent the secret of Japanese efficiency in other matters, which I think is due mainly to comprehensive study, to assimulative capacity, and especially to the power of making a direct application of the knowledge they have acquired. The trained marksman will save a lot of ammunition and time and avoid the overlooking of strategic opportunities.

Now apply this to the missionary and missionary training. The productive value of a missionary from the standpoint of a board is both qualitative and quantitative. I shall not refer at length to the qualitative side of it. Probably that is in the minds especially of those who are identified with the educational side of the work of this Board. But from the quantitative side we have again and again had reference made to the retarding effect of irreparable blunders that are made by ill-trained, immature missionaries on the field. The element of time comes in there.

But there is the positive side. It refers to the speed that is gained by efficiency. We have in West China a language school for our missionaries, and our Board requires each new missionary to spend the whole of the first two years in language study, the first year in the school, and the second year at one of the stations; but during the second year a new missionary is not permitted to speak on any occasions excepting when the audience is composed entirely of missionaries.

When I visited Japan I thought that the efficiency of the missionary force as a whole became very much limited by the comparative inability of missionaries to use the Japanese language, and I took the position with our mission council that unless the council in its powers of appointment of missionaries on the field would reserve the first two years for language study I would not recommend the sending out of any more missionaries. They have adopted that policy. I believe that the reserving of those years on the field for language study gains in point of efficiency many, many times the number of those years in their after service.

From the standpoint of economy and the expenditure of funds it is worth the while of the Board to contribute to greater efficiency. And if this be true in the illustrations which I have given of language study on the field, I believe that it is quite as true of those branches of preparation which can receive more thorough, masterly attention in the homeland before the missionaries go to the field.

Another aspect of the quantitative value of the missionary has reference to the missionary as a leader—the multiplied power of the missionary. The thought in my mind to-day is: How can one chase a thousand and two put ten thousand to flight? How can one missionary become a hundred? How can we produce a leadership which will have multiplying power in the church on the field? In this sense I believe that every missionary should be a normal teacher. (I am not now referring to the pedagogic side of educational work.) Every missionary on the field should consider that his great task and opportunity is not so much how to open an increasing number of outstations and to devote more time to preaching to an increasing number of new congregations as it is how to raise up and train an increasing number of native pastors; the great task of the educational missionary is to raise up and train a sufficient number of Christian educational leaders on the field; and the great work of the medical missionary is not merely to attend to the duties of his hospital, but to raise up a Christian medical profession. And I believe that it is in the solution of the question respecting this

multiplying power of missionaries on the field that the mission boards can find the key to the speedy evangelization of the world.

I was delighted, with the chairman of the committee, to discover the almost unanimous response, practically unanimous response, from the board secretaries with regard to the need of increased efficiency and of preparation, and the prospective work of this Board. Am I right in this conjecture, that up to the present time it is mainly the board secretaries officially representing the boards that are conscious of this need? So far as the Board that I represent is concerned, I fear that is the case, and as far as the secretary is concerned it is true only in a very limited degree. But I consider it to be the duty of myself as a secretary and a member of this Board to co-operate with this Board of Preparation, which has before it the task of educating the Mission Boards along this line if we are to receive that sympathetic co-operation which is necessary if the work of the Board of Preparation be made effective.

I respond heartily to the statement which the secretary of the Board has made with regard to the attitude of the students. Only within the past week I had a conference with four students, four missionary candidates, who would be ready so far as the ordinary preparation is concerned to go to the foreign field in the fall of 1913. For the first time in the past seven years our Board is in the position where we are for economic reasons obliged to adjust ourselves to circumstances for a year, with the possibility that we may not be able to send out many, if any missionaries in 1913 to the foreign field. It has seemed to me a Providential opportunity to introduce this idea of an extra year's training, and I suggested this to these four men. Two out of the four at once responded and said: "We will be glad to give that extra year to enriching our equipment for the field," and they are planning to take a year in the Hartford School of Missions.

I think our Board will need some education on that line. This is a vital point. I desire to express my appreciation of a visit which we had from President Mackenzie in Toronto during the past year, when he addressed a representative gathering of educational men and missionary leaders in Toronto. The result of that conference was the appointment of a joint committee representing the denominational colleges of Canada and the mission boards of Canada, and that committee has had several conferences, showing clearly that they would all gladly co-operate in developing this movement in Canada, even to the establishment of an interdenominational mission school in Toronto. But the point was at last reached when, with the greatest unanimity as to the desirability of the project, the responsibility of working out the scheme was thrown back upon the Mission Boards, the only stress upon them being the financing of the scheme. Until we have brought our Mission Boards into an intelligent, sympathetic co-operation we cannot get the financial support which is required.

President H. C. King: I have read this report of Dr. Barton with great appreciation and sympathy, because it seems to me to touch upon so many of the weakest points as they impressed me in my own year in observing missions in India and China and Japan.

It is very obvious, I think, that as soon as you look at the question from the point of view of the educator, the great demand is for time. That is the real problem. Time is the great desideratum. It is no doubt desirable that the missionary candidate should have all these subjects. The question is how he is going to get them in. It is evident that it is impossible for him to do everything. We may as well face

that to start with. The preparation cannot cover the sixty years that have been referred to. You can only start a man, at best, and that start, it seems to me, involves three things: First, that it is most important that he should have points of view, that he should get the right points of view in these different subjects. In the second place, that he should have knowledge of the sources and so be able to go on. And, in the third place, that the study that he has taken should give him a spur for that further development of the subject. If you can insure those three things you have done a good deal toward meeting the whole demand. It is evident that the subjects laid out are sufficient alone to take the entire theological course. They do call for a large amount of time.

But it is obvious that the missionary needs all the ordinary fundamentals as well. You cannot in his case subtract the fundamentals of the theological course. He needs all that the ordinary minister has, and you want him to have all these other things besides. And yet it is perhaps worth our remembering—as bearing upon the question as to whether the missionary schools should be separated from the seminaries—that the whole trend of theological study in its greater emphasis on the historical and on the educational sides is directly in the line of what would be better for the missionary, too. All the ministers need increasingly this kind of training. Those of us who are really facing the theological problem to-day—the problem of theological education—see that not less but more have we got to get the point of view of comparative religion, of the historical method, and be able to apply educational methods as well in the ministry. So that the things that are asked for in this report would be desirable for the ordinary minister as well as for the missionary.

Some suggestions may be given, perhaps, as to how, in addition to what I have said, this demand for time might be met. In the first place, it is evident that we need to go back a good ways to get a missionary ready. It is very desirable that he should do something in the way of election in college on these lines. Certainly the pedagogic work and the philosophical work—the sociological, too, except on the specifically religious side—should have been elected in college. That ought not all to be left for his seminary years.

Then I think we have not realized that on the whole we have been going backward in theological education as to the time demanded, as compared with a few years ago. In the last few years there has come in the fashion of telescoping courses, which has made it possible for a man to cover the first year of the seminary course in his last year in college; so that it has been true in recent years that many students have gone into the ministry with a year's less preparation than the fully trained men twenty years ago had to have. In view of the severe demand on the ministry to-day, such a shortening of the course seems to me deplorable.

I am sure that is one of the places where we can get another year. There should be no telescoping of courses. There should be a full college course required, and three years after that. And when you compare the ministry with other professions you will remember that other professions have been increasing their requirements—the best of them now generally requiring four years of professional study; and the need of further preparation on the part of the minister is quite as great as the need of further preparation in these other professions. I should like myself to see a four years' professional course for the ministry. Then something could be done. But at any rate we ought not

to fail to get the full three years of theological training after a full college course.

I do not know whether I am bringing skeletons out of the closet, but I have a feeling that there is another place where time might be gained. I do not believe that, as a whole, the theological students begin to work as hard as the students in other professions, and I think they might be asked to work a good deal harder. I am afraid there is a good deal of waste yet under the lecture method in many of the theological seminaries. I do not say in all of them. The lecture method can be handled so that there will not be a waste, but it can be handled so that there is an enormous waste—so that the student can cover only about a sixth part of which he ought to cover in the time given to the subject. Now there is a place where a good deal more could be done, I think.

Of course, it may be that if we bring in these special subjects we shall have to make some limitation in the old subjects. I think in many cases that ought to mean probably that a man must sacrifice his Hebrew. We have the testimony of one of the first Hebrew scholars in the country that the ordinary student does not get enough Hebrew, anyhow, to hurt him. He had better sacrifice it even from that point of view. But whether that be true or not, the situation is very much the same as it is in the college. There is no use of our trying to react to the old classical standard. We cannot. Since the college course was made up of the three subjects, Latin, Greek and mathematics, there have a lot of things happened that make up the modern world and with which the modern student must be acquainted, and you are not sending him forth as an educated man into the modern world without some touch with those subjects. That simply means that the time given to the old subjects has to be cut down. You cannot keep your cake and eat it too.

I am not at all sure that it would not be possible to make some gain here, too, through some union missionary summer school planned in connection with, perhaps, one of the universities. Something possibly could be done there toward meeting this further demand for time.

There is encouragement in the fact that there is, further, a gratifying tendency to provide the subjects desired by the Committee more and more in theological courses. But it often happens that they have to be split up into such fragments in order that the student may get any taste of them at all, because of the limitations of time, that as much has not been accomplished as it is certainly desirable should be.

In the matter of preparation, I should like to say one word of emphasis, too, upon the demand for a knowledge of the Bible. I have been inclined to think for a good many years, frankly, that the thing theological seminaries did least well was to give a knowledge of the Bible. I am sure when I graduated from the theological seminary the subject that I should have been least willing to bear examination upon was the Bible. I should have been able to stand an examination better on almost anything else; and yet I knew a good deal more Bible than many of my classmates, I am sure. I do not believe that in this attempt to approach it always through the original language that anything like the ground has been covered that ought to be covered. I think there should be a new emphasis upon the study of the English Bible, of mastering the contents, of really getting a broad and yet accurate survey of the whole field; and we ought to remember that that is not less but more demanded if you wish to emphasize the modern point of view, or the historical point of view, or the evolution point of view. If you

want to emphasize those, they call, not less but more for a knowledge of the entire Bible; and I do not think that any of our seminaries are doing there what they ought to do—my own included—though I hope we are making some gain.

It is worth remembering, too, that this whole problem of time, which is, it seems to me, one of the most difficult in connection with this problem of missionary preparation, is helped by this other suggestion by the Committee of a list of books on the subjects named; for that would itself give the opportunity to carry forward intelligently the lines of study that have just been begun in the theological seminaries, so that this properly belongs just at this point in the report. This carefully annotated bibliography is one of the most important things that the student can have if he has really gotten an intelligent start, for it gives him the sources upon which he must work—and that would be something, I am sure, to help out the preparation. He cannot do it all beforehand; but if he has been started on the right lines, that itself will be a great help. If the seminary really started the student with knowledge of the several important points of view, and a spur to further study, he will go a long way toward bringing these things up later. But he does need the help of a bibliography.

And this bibliography I would not extend merely along specifically missionary lines, but I think it ought to cover the fields of comparative religion, philosophy of religion, and so on. That would be a great help, it should be remembered, for all the ministry. Take such a work, for example, as that now coming out, Hastings' "Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics," and one can see that the point of view represented is precisely that which you wish the missionary to get. But that work was projected because it was believed that that was the point of view that every minister and that every intelligent student of religion needed to get. So a careful bibliography of the history and philosophy of religion would be of great help, not only to the missionary candidates, but to all missionaries and to all the ministry.

The bibliography might well be extended, I think, to cover also recommended books for translation. One of the things that troubled me a good deal in my journey around the world was to find that so few books that seemed to me significant were being translated. There was too much material that it did not seem to be important to have translated into any language, but not enough books of really first rate importance were being made available; and if that need could be kept in mind also in the recommendation of a bibliography, I think the missionaries would be grateful as well as those that they were trying to serve. And, of course, such a list must be steadily renewed.

I have been particularly glad of the report made by President Mackenzie this morning, indicating that a new emphasis was to be placed on the missionary's learning the language of the people to whom he goes, because it became very clear to me that that emphasis had been unduly relaxed and that many missionaries were handicapping themselves for their future work because they evidently had not gotten the mastery of the language. The demand for immediate service is so great and it is so much easier than it used to be to get on somehow without exhaustive knowledge of the vernacular, through other workers in the mission, that there is less pressure upon new missionaries to get the language thoroughly from the start.

The need, too, of the most radical conscientiousness on the part of the missionary was impressed upon me tremendously. I do not know that anything impressed me more than the growing conviction

that if anybody on earth needed to be radically conscientious it was the missionary, especially in the non-episcopal forms of mission government, where he is not much supervised, and where he determines his own work so largely that unless he is a man of the most stubborn conscientiousness he is very likely not to be doing what he ought to be doing, and not to hold himself up to an efficient standard of work and growth; and perhaps the very suggestion of lines of growth that he is to make might help him at this point. Radical conscientiousness, unusual initiative, and determination to grow, seemed to me to be especially required for missionary workers. I do not mean that the missionaries generally failed reasonably to measure up to such a standard, but I do mean to say that those qualities seemed to me to need peculiar emphasis.

I should hope, too, that there might be, as a result of this better preparation on the part of the missionary, a hopeful reaction on the better training of the native workers. I do not know that there is anything we can do through this Board especially to help them, and I hope the situation is growing better, but I came back from my survey feeling that the weakest point of all in the missionary work as a whole was the training of the native workers.

It may reasonably be expected, also, that this better preparation on the study side, this better understanding of the psychology and philosophy of religion and the facts concerning the religions with which they have especially to do, might have a very beneficial effect on the missionary himself in bringing him into a spirit of deeper sympathy and respect toward those among whom he is to labor. I feel myself so absolutely certain that the thing that Jesus is requiring of us as His disciples is deep reverence for the personalities, with whom we have to do, that I cannot help thinking that we shall not be truly representing the spirit of Christ to those among whom we are trying to labor abroad if there is not a very deep sympathy and sympathetic respect for the best that they have. It seems to me very interesting in China just now that it should be missionaries mainly that are keeping the Chinese classics in education. I think that is very interesting, and it is right. But that same spirit ought surely to permeate all our work, and it is more certain to do so if the preparation that is called for in his report is obtained.

Prof. Harlan P. Beach: My topic reads "From the View-point of an Educationalist Studying the Work of the Missionaries on the Mission Field." I will try to confine myself, therefore, to the educationalist's point of view who also looks upon the work on the mission field from the view-point of the Boards and of their committees.

I. *The actual status of missionary education.* In two tours around the world I have visited all the great mission fields except Latin America, and have met, I suppose, some two thousand missionaries, and have visited and examined somewhat thoroughly about one hundred and twenty-five institutions of higher learning in these fields. I will state a few disappointing facts connected with these investigations:

1. I may say that I was disappointed to find in these educational institutions very few men and women who have been technically, or even adequately, prepared for the work which they are doing. The proportion varied in different countries, but I think that in no country will you find a larger proportion of educators than one-fourth, and commonly no larger percentage than ten per cent. of these workers who have had any pedagogical and practical preparation.

2. It follows that these educationalists are without adequate ideals

at the outset and for a good part of their educational career. To make the matter worse, most of the countries to which they go are in the first stages of educational development, and, consequently, they have no ideals which are ready to hand for the missionaries' use. Japan is, to a certain extent, an exception in this respect, and so too are some of the fields where Great Britain's educational policy is the basis of the missionaries' program.

3. Quite commonly I found in these countries that the education which was being imparted was altogether too Occidental in character. When one goes to a land without any educational system it is perfectly natural to establish there the same educational scheme which the missionary has been used to at home, or which has been used in his own education. The result is that diametrically opposed civilizations and needs are ministered to by a single method. The races thus tend to lose their original character instead of being developed along lines which are wholly desirable. Moreover, much of the education thus imparted has no practical value, whereas, in view of the tremendous demands made by the emergence of these peoples in the civilized world, it should provide them with every practical aid possible.

4. Another thing which was not so noticeable, but which was frequently in evidence, is the lack of adaptation of the methods to the ends desired. I could illustrate this easily, but simply note it in passing.

II. *The missionaries regarded from the non-educational viewpoint.* I noted other defects which were common to missionaries of every grade, though it seemed to me that they affect educationists more than they do medical and evangelistic missionaries except in one particular.

1. A considerable proportion of the educators were illy equipped linguistically. An excuse in the case of many such men is found in the fact that, in a large majority of the best missionary institutions of higher grade, English is used, and is a medium of instruction. Professors, and presidents even, of such institutions asked the question why they should trouble to learn the language of their people when the students themselves desire to use English almost exclusively in order that they might have a fuller training in that important language. The reply seemed to be self-evident—viz., that when men and women expect to spend their lives as educational missionaries it is of the utmost importance that they should fully understand their students. This cannot be done satisfactorily without a thorough-going knowledge of the thought of these people, and that, in turn, cannot be learned without an accurate knowledge of their speech. Other reasons for being well equipped linguistically are self-evident.

2. Even more than the evangelistic missionary have I found the educationist on the mission field deficient in certain items of essential knowledge. One of these is a thorough mastery of the Bible—the Old Testament as well as the New. While science is taught in these schools, every grade of missionary is there to teach, or illustrate, the Bible. It is preëminently the book of Christian civilization, and among races that are just evolving has a use which our more advanced civilization does not so keenly feel.

3. Another item of essential knowledge is found in the mastery of the history of one's adopted people. While most of the older missionaries have a fair knowledge of such history, it is very common among the younger teachers to care nothing about such stupid records as one finds in China, India, and even Japan. Notwithstanding, the whole background of our work is historical. It is necessary to know

whence a people has come and what the resources of a race are if one hopes to lead them to a higher and more perfect stage.

4. An even more lamentable failure in knowledge, holding true of all varieties of missionaries, even the evangelistic, is an inadequate acquaintance with the religions which dominate one's adopted countrymen. Too many evangelistic missionaries, and a few educators, merely ridicule existing faiths, though they do not now talk of them as being of the devil. The great objective of all of our work is the implanting of Christianity, and this is impossible while existing religions are allowed to hold their present sway. Certain elements in these faiths are helpful in building up the Christian religion, as foundations or suggestions at least. I could instance many cases from a number of countries which would prove how harmful to our cause a misunderstanding of religions and an unfair use of them for the sake of building up Christianity is to that very process.

III. *Missionary by-products of our educational system.* Jesus bade His disciples go and teach all nations, and the dominant function of every variety of missionary is that of teaching. Every phase of missionary effort calls for ability in that direction, though not every educationalist is vitally concerned with some of this teaching.

1. Sunday schools stand, perhaps, foremost in this list of by-products, since far more teaching of religious truth is done there than from the pulpit or in the secular school. In only a small proportion of the Sunday schools visited did there seem to be an adequate program for religious instruction. Inasmuch as a number of teachers were needed, untrained native Christians had to be used for the purpose, and in many cases their teaching was next to useless. When one remembers the high state of efficiency reached by our own Sunday schools, one longs for greater attention to this most serious lack.

2. If I may use the word liturgics in a somewhat adapted sense, I would say that ignorance of the possibilities of this method of promoting truth is almost universal except in liturgical churches. In America practically all who attend churches are literate, whereas in mission lands a goodly proportion of the old people cannot read. For such persons, in order that the service may be shared in by as many as possible, a liturgy of some sort is highly desirable. As a matter of fact, in non-liturgical churches more or less use of responsive services and simple liturgies is made. The great liturgies of the Episcopal and Lutheran churches are not known by many missionaries, and even where known they cannot be used as profitably as a liturgy prepared on purpose for more primitive peoples. It is an item of missionary teaching to which little attention has been given, either by liturgical or non-liturgical missionaries. Much would be gained if the Episcopal and Lutheran missionaries would forget that they had a liturgy adapted to people in England and Germany and really formulate or adopt one for the peoples to whom they go.

3. Somewhat different demands are made in the direction of catechetics. The catecumenate of the early Church is found in most mission fields today in one form or another. I am sorry to say that a good many catechisms have not been written wisely or with the careful consideration of what truth is most essential to be taught, and in what order. Here, again, there is great need for our modern education to make changes which would greatly quicken the process of learning the vital truths of Christianity.

4. General religious instruction is another by-product of the educational scheme, and yet one that is so pervasive that it covers every-

thing that the missionary does, almost. The preacher is not so successful who preaches as if to a Western audience. His sermon must be largely didactic, even though it must have much of the hortatory and practical in it. The head of the family at morning and evening prayers must be a teacher, for here he has some of his best opportunities for training his household servants and other friends in a familiar way. The man who is teaching manual training and other industrial work should know how to teach; but, unfortunately, a good many whom I have seen have not been prepared to make this part of their work as effective as it might be.

IV. *What should be done to increase educational efficiency?* In closing, I wish to make three suggestions before adding a special appendix:

1. Every educational missionary should be a partial master at least of the theory and practice of teaching. Theory is essential for the sake of ideals, but if either of these items must be dispensed with I should prefer the theory to go rather than the actual practice obtainable either in some good teachers' training institution or in actual school work.

2. A study of educational ideals as related to one's future field should also be insisted upon. Having mastered the theory of Occidental education, one is prepared now to face conditions in the field. Government systems in these lines are often imperfect, and the leading educators are anxious to get from a missionary new ideas. There is thus an opportunity to mould the educational feature of many nascent nations. It will be hard to forget that one is an American, but it must be done if the best interests of China, India and Africa are to be subserved. This is another reason why the missionary should know thoroughly the history and the language of his adopted people.

3. More important than either of these items in the matter of efficiency is it that we send out only such educators as have a vision of God. If you look at the biographies of educational missionaries, from Dr. Duff to Stewart of Lovedale, you will find that they have been successful in making character and influencing the higher life of nations just in proportion as God has been written large upon their own lives and upon their educational program. It should be understood always that missionary education cannot be merely secular. God must be the warp of the whole educational fabric. This is the great gift of missions to any nation, and to allow the Father of all men to be eclipsed by the minutiæ of mathematics, geography, history, etc., is to fail in our fulfillment of the great commission.

I said that I wished to add a word by way of appendix. It has to do with the Oxford Summer School, to which reference has been made by a previous speaker. Perhaps I am the only member of this Board who has had the privilege of being at the initial summer school, held last August by the British Board of Study. I wish to say only a few words concerning it. Confessedly it was an experimental piece of work. It was, perhaps, unfortunate that when only four weeks could be given to the training of missionary candidates it should have been sub-divided into periods of a fortnight each, so that many of the candidates were present only two weeks. Notwithstanding this extremely serious handicap, I wish to testify to the great value of that month of work. The young men and women gathered there got a vision of what was before them and a suggestive treatment of a variety of important topics which will make an impression upon their future lives and doubtless will give direction to their studies on the field.

Should our own Board think it best at some future time to establish such a school, I earnestly hope that it may not be permitted to lapse into a fortnight's study, or even a month. At least six weeks are desirable, if anything satisfactory is to be accomplished.

May I add that in what has already been said I have been trying to fulfil the ungracious task assigned me? Do not assume from what has been said that educational work on the foreign field is a failure. It is remarkable what has been accomplished through this form of effort, and my only excuse for dwelling upon the defects is that we may realize what need there is for our Board to remedy weaknesses which are due, not to individual incompetency, but rather to a lack of training which can readily be remedied. I fully believe that this Board can accomplish as much through furthering the better preparation of missionaries, both for the educational and evangelistic work, as any one of the sub-committees of the Edinburgh Conference Continuation Committee.

Dr. T. H. P. Sailer spoke as follows on "Specialization in the Preparation of the Foreign Missionary Candidate":

1. *The Dangers of Specializing.* It must be admitted that there are some dangers in specializing. Specialization may make a man narrow in his vision, sympathy or abilities. It may deflect him from larger aims. There are certain practical difficulties connected with it.

a. It may prevent a free interchange of workers on the foreign field. Pioneer life always puts a premium on the all-round man, the jack-of-all-trades. In many places missionary work is yet at the pioneer stage. Stations are undermanned and workers are often removed by furlough or illness. Under these circumstances the ideal man, from the standpoint of one who is responsible for the disposition of forces, is the utility man who can fill any gap and is willing to undertake any job. Specialists are less apt to be such men. They sometimes lack the ability and enthusiasm for the form of work that is most needed.

b. Specialization along some lines may weaken the evangelistic spirit. A man may lose sight of the spiritual welfare of those with whom he has to deal in his absorption in their intellectual welfare.

c. Specialization may lead a man to trust to method instead of personality. The evangelist is thrown back upon his personality, since it is obviously his chief weapon. The physician or educationalist has a more organized method and may trust to this without utilizing his personality as he should.

d. Specialization may mould men for conditions which do not exist on the foreign field. The result may be that when men do not find the conditions to which they are accustomed they will either become dissatisfied or else try to force the conditions to meet their abilities.

Stated in this bald way, considerable exception might be taken to any of these points, but they nevertheless indicate real difficulties, all of which have actually been experienced and which we must at least keep in mind.

As far as medicine is concerned, we have decided to take the risk of these dangers. Inefficiency in medical work demonstrates itself too quickly and mercilessly. We, therefore, permit the physician to specialize, and while we encourage him to do evangelistic work, we know enough not to encourage the evangelist to try to run a hospital. We endeavor to secure missionary physicians with evangelistic spirit, personality and willingness to adapt themselves to conditions, but we insist upon thorough and specialized training.

As to education, there is much more hesitation about specializing, as is clearly indicated by Dr. Barton's report. It is generally felt that educational science, so-called, is at a much more empirical stage than medical science. The word pedagogy arouses much suspicion. It is sometimes regarded as a device of the anæmic and unimaginative for concealing their lack of personality. I heard a Presbyterian Board Secretary, though not a Secretary of a foreign board, once say that pedagogy and psychology were the two golden calves which were leading Israel astray. There is a feeling that the aims of the secular school are not identical with those of the mission school, and that the obligation of the former to refrain from distinctively religious teaching makes it an unsafe model. Consequently, when the secular school comes offering aid it is feared *et dona ferentes*. This feeling varies in different quarters, but it does exist and is partly responsible for the fact that board secretaries have been less keen for men trained in education than for trained physicians.

2. *Dangers of Not Specializing.*—But if there are undeniable dangers in specializing, there are equally real dangers in a failure to specialize.

a. A waste of time. There are many things in educational method which a man might learn in America instead of discovering for himself on the foreign field after many experiments. Not only is the time of missionaries wasted by their ignorance, but that of their native assistants, and, most of all, of their pupils. For instance, a missionary in Egypt told me that by a simple device in flexible grading that had occurred to her, she was enabling girls to accomplish in six months what had formerly taken eighteen. I have no doubt that an immense amount of valuable time is being wasted all over the foreign field because our missionaries are ignorant of methods which they might easily learn by a little specializing. The time saved could be utilized for more distinctively missionary values.

b. Lack of efficiency. It would seem that no educationalists can be more concerned for practical efficiency than missionaries. Certainly none have more at stake. Their aim is to make their constituency effective in membership and leadership of the native church and of the nation out of all proportion to its number. They simply can not afford to have the word missionary as applied to education become a synonym for second-class efficiency.

Moreover, few educationalists have such difficulties to face. We cannot realize in this country what it means to have to teach in four vernaculars in a single school and include four foreign languages in the curriculum in addition. The mental and moral background of the pupils is in general far inferior to that which we meet in this country. Teachers in Egypt told me that their boys were ignorant of scientific facts that would be commonplace to any American child. Missionaries lack models to imitate and authorities to consult, both of which are so largely available for teachers in this country. They are often obliged to work with very meager equipment and with ill-adjusted text books. It would seem that they need much more thorough specialization than teachers in this country. As a matter of fact, some of them are quite innocent of effective methods. In a school in Egypt I saw a very peculiar bench and inquired about it. The good missionary said that he had copied it from a model in a little district school in Pennsylvania in which he taught thirty years ago. Which things are a parable. I fear that the good missionary had borrowed more that was peculiar to his former experience in Pennsylvania than ideas of bench construction.

Such a man had manifestly an altogether inadequate training for teaching, with the complex and aggravated difficulties of the foreign field. A further reason for the high efficiency of educational missions is the growing competition of government systems in non-Christian countries. We have seen this in India and Japan, but perhaps in China we flatter ourselves that we are in no immediate danger. One thing that we must remember is that when a government system does get into operation it rolls inland like a tidal wave, faster than a man can run, and therefore we cannot afford to linger on the shore, but must start at once for the hills as fast as we can. If we neglect an immediate improvement of our work we shall be overwhelmed by a competition that advances faster than we possibly can. This competition will come not only from the government, but also from religious bodies and all sorts of local societies.

c. The third danger in not specializing is that it usually means an inability to train native teachers. The missionary may teach by knack or by sheer force of personality, but without a clear analysis and understanding of educational methods he will be unable to communicate these efficiently to others. The training of native teachers to effectiveness is one of the greatest educational needs at present on the foreign field.

d. The fourth danger is the inability to locate difficulties and solve large problems. There are many situations in mission schools to-day which will not be relieved until a man with broad educational training comes into control. There are numerous difficulties which an expert would at once recognize and meet. There are large problems which can only be handled by men who see the whole background of education.

e. Finally, there is danger of a narrow conception of the school. A lack of training by no means guarantees a broad viewpoint. The missionary altogether without educational specialization may simply copy in detail some single model which he has seen and be more narrow in his methods than any specialist.

3. *How Can We Avoid Both Sets of Dangers?*

a. To avoid the dangers of specializing, our candidate secretaries must demand from our volunteers a willingness to render help wherever it is most needed, an earnest evangelistic spirit, a forceful personality and some versatility. We must do the best we can to secure these qualities.

b. On the other hand, we must demand a broad educational training. There is a certain kind of specialization which narrows because it devotes itself exclusively to a restricted field; but there is another kind of specialization, which broadens because it seeks to discover connections between things and to make practical applications of principles along many lines. It is this latter kind of specialization which is attracting most attention in educational books to-day. I believe that those who have not kept in touch with recent educational thought will be surprised to find how broad the conception of the school has become, and in what a missionary spirit it is endeavoring to reach all classes of society and render many kinds of help in a way that was not customary even fifteen years ago. We should urge volunteers to take two or three years for a study of the theory and practice of education after their college course. Practical work alone in American surroundings without theory might be narrowing, and theory alone might be academic. It is quite important that candidate secretaries should understand the scope and quality as well as the quantity of training which volunteers have had.

They should acquire broad ideas of the function of the school, of the adaptation of the curriculum to the differing social and economic conditions, of supervision and teacher training. They should get into touch with educational progress and be is a position to move on with it.

c. In addition, however, to anything that might be learned from teachers' colleges or normal schools, there should be a course at least of reading on the relation of education to missionary work. This course should present the specific aims of missionary education; the place of religious training in schools that are not hampered by government public school restrictions; the principal needs of the native church, with suggestions as to how these can best be provided for. This is greatly needed as a supplement to what is being offered at present.

This presupposes that boards should get into contact with candidates far in advance, and seek to guide their studies and practical work. If this is done, both sets of dangers should be avoided, and the tremendously important benefits of specialization realized.

Dr. Robert E. Speer: There is just one point that I think we ought to keep in mind so that we will not be dealing too much with the theory of this matter, and that is the very great difficulty of getting men and women who will commit themselves to going to the mission field a long time in advance of the actual period at which they go. Now our difficulty is chiefly that. There are men and women, of course, who are thinking long in advance of going and desiring to go, but, as every Board here will testify, our great difficulty is to get men and women who will definitely commit themselves a long time in advance. I spent all day yesterday in one of our theological seminaries. The difficulty was to get students to commit themselves to going to the mission field. They wanted to put it off until nearer the end of their seminary course. Now a great deal of what we have been saying has rested on the assumption that it is an easy matter to get men and women long in advance of the time of going so guaranteed to go that the Boards or the home church would be justified in spending time and money on their special preparation. We have a problem here that lies back of the problems that we are dealing with in this conference.

President W. W. White: One word in discharge of an obligation laid upon me last night by one of our teachers, who had just come from a class in which were nine prospective missionaries. The majority of these are taking a full year in our school. Only one of the group knows the field to which he is going. The teacher was very much wrought up over this state of affairs. I cite this in illustration of the point which was made this morning. Is it not possible for the Boards in more instances than at present to decide earlier on the countries to which their candidates are going?—perhaps early enough to allow the students at least a year in which to adapt their training in view of their fields?

Prof. Edward W. Capen: Just by way of showing the high grade of missionary preparation needed in certain fields let me read an extract from a paper presented a year ago in Japan by a leading missionary, in which he showed how the intellectual standard in the Kumi-ai body was rising, and cited the topics announced to the candidates for ordination about six weeks before the examination as to their intellectual qualifications. The topics suggested were:

The historic Christ and the spiritual Christ.
The meaning of the Trinity.
The significance of salvation.
The Hegelian philosophy and the tendency of the new theology.

Prof. Eucken's philosophy and present Christian thought.
The influence of the Ritschlian philosophy on the modern Christian world.
The relation between Luther and Zwingli.
The relation between the Puritans and the Separatists.
How should the pastor direct the work of the Sunday School?
Methods of evangelistic work for individuals.
How should the minister arrange his daily programme?
History and mission of the Kumi-ai Church.
Main features of the discussion concerning the Old Testament.
The rise and development of prophecy.
What is the wisdom literature?
The Messianic thought of the Book of Isaiah and that of Jesus.
The Logia of Matthew and the Ur-Mark.
The relation between Paul's theology and the Gospel of John.
The Book of Revelation and its fundamental teaching.

Dr. T. H. P. Sailer: It seems to me that, to meet this difficulty, it might not be impossible to formulate some general suggestions that could be sent out to all the student volunteers in colleges. I believe that the Board of Missionary Preparation should issue a pamphlet containing suggestions for the preparation of volunteers while in college. The pamphlet should specify various courses and lines of reading that would be most useful for evangelistic, medical or educational work. It should help volunteers to see these needs in the large and in their broad relationships to the entire missionary enterprise. I think that our Boards should spend more time in correspondence with candidates, and should take the attitude that even where men are not sure of going to the field they should correspond with their Boards and get advice as to the direction of their studies. Men sometimes volunteer for the foreign field as early as the freshman year in college, and, because they do not apply to their Boards until the senior year in theology or medicine they are left for seven or eight years without specific advice as to preparation that might be very useful to them.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE II

TO STUDY THE PRESENT FACILITIES AFFORDED MISSIONARY CANDIDATES IN INSTITUTIONS AND "MOVEMENTS" AND TO DISCOVER WHAT FURTHER FACILITIES FOR THE TRAINING OF MISSIONARY CANDIDATES ARE NEEDED, ESPECIALLY IN THE FOLLOWING SUBJECTS: (1) SCIENCE AND HISTORY OF MISSIONS; (2) RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD; (3) SOCIOLOGY; (4) PEDAGOGY; (5) SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGES OF DIFFERENT FIELDS; (6) ENGLISH BIBLE

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:—Prof. Charles R. Erdman, D. D., Chairman; Prof. Ernest D. Burton, D. D., Mr. Fennell P. Turner, Rev. Wilbert W. White, Ph. D., Miss Helen Calder, Rev. R. P. Mackay, D. D., Rev. E. Y. Mullins, D. D., Rev. Charles R. Watson, D. D.

PRESENTED BY PROF. CHARLES R. ERDMAN, CHAIRMAN

Prof. Erdman: In presenting the Report of Committee II. the chairman desires to point out that there were two points suggested for the consideration of our committee: first, what are the *present facilities* for training missionaries, particularly along the line of what has been termed "special missionary preparation"; and, secondly, what *further facilities* should be afforded?

In answering the first question—namely, as to present facilities—the Committee simply reminds you that very exhaustive investigation was made at the time of the Edinburgh Conference, and that its reports, which are accessible to us all, give answer, in part, to this first question, that is to say, as to the present facilities for (1) the study of *the science and history of missions* and (2) *the religions of the world.* The Edinburgh Conference reports tell us that only one-half of our theological instutions at the present time deal with those questions at all, and that those deal with the questions only to this extent: they usually devote two curriculum hours for one academic year, or two per cent. of the whole number of hours, to these topics. The reports came from some 125 institutions.

As to (3) *sociology,* we find that practically all the theological institutions include that in their curriculum. Of course, it is taught to a larger extent in some than in others; but nearly all of them claim to include it in their curricula.

In the matter of (4) *pedagogy,* we find there are a good many places where opportunities for study of this science are offered, not so much in our theological colleges or seminaries as in other institutions. For instance, the Teachers College of New York, the University of Chicago, Cornell University, Harvard University and the University of Toronto—all of these have excellent courses in pedagogy.

As to (5) the *science of language* and *language study,* hardly more than a beginning has been made in any of our institutions. The train-

ing of missionaries in the languages has been done almost entirely on the mission fields. However, some instruction has been more recently offered in phonetics and in certain Oriental languages.

As to the matter of the instruction in (6) *English Bible,* our committee hesitated to attempt a tabulation of methods and courses of Bible instruction. It seemed a very difficult thing to do. All our seminaries teach the Bible, and all our courses are supposed to be drawn from the Bible. I think we all feel that the students do not know as much of the Bible as they should, when they graduate; but, nevertheless, I think you will probably agree with us that it is difficult to tabulate the facts as to how much Bible is being taught. However, we do refer to the matter in one of our recommendations at the close of this report.

As to the second general question: *"What further facilities are needed?"* before attempting a complete answer we must have in mind, first of all, some definite ideal, some standard. What is the goal toward which we are to move? When this has been determined we can decide what facilities should be offered, so that it may be attained.

Secondly, we must have in mind the fact that an ever-increasing number of institutions for the special training of missionaries are being established in the foreign field. Now, if we are to train our missionary candidates on the foreign field in languages and all these lines of special missionary preparation, obviously there will be less and less need in our own country of multiplying institutions or facilities for such training. It will still be an open question as to how much should be done in this country.

Thirdly, it is obvious we must have a different kind of missionary training for the different classes of missionaries, whether they are to be pastors, physicians, teachers, etc.

Then, fourthly, the question should emerge: How far shall special missionary training be simultaneous with the other lines of training? That is, how far shall a theological student, for example, be expected, during his course, to receive "special missionary training"? Shall the two lines of training be simultaneous? Or, shall his "special training" follow his "theological course"?

Then the fifth question, Whether or not candidates for the missionary field who are taking special work should receive financial aid from the Boards or from other sources? A very practical question.

Now it is with these questions in mind that this Committee suggests a number of propositions for your consideration and approval.

The first one may occasion no discussion—that "missionary training should be thorough and scientific." We probably all agree upon that. That is to say, a young man cannot omit his systematic theology and read a book on some missionary hero and think that he has made a fair substitution and get into the mission field by a "short cut." A cheap kind of "special training" is not to be substituted for serious work. All training, whether "special" or what we have called "fundamental," should be scientific and thorough. We all agree to that as an ideal.

But now, secondly, "there should be established in all the fields where a considerable number of missionaries are ministering to people of one language, schools for the training of missionaries. When possible, they should be developed from existing language schools. They should be interdenominational schools. They should give instruction in the language, history and customs of the country in which they are located; also, in the Bible and science and history of missions. The plans for these schools should be matured and published as soon as

possible, in order to avoid unnecessary enlargement of present theological curricula or the multiplication of missionary training schools at home." The theological curriculum, at the present time, is pretty well filled. It might be altered in some particulars. Nevertheless, we can hardly expect to insert a year of "special training" in our present curriculum; and we feel that, rather than overcrowding that curriculum, it would be better if a large part of this "special training" should be done on the mission fields, in special missionary training schools.

Our third recommendation is, accordingly, that there should be given at least one year of special training to all our candidates. Whether that is done at one time or another, it seemed to be the agreement of the committee at the present time—that the goal be aimed at is to secure at least the amount of one year of special missionary training.

The fourth is, that "ministerial and medical students should not be expected to secure adequate missionary preparation during a regular course of professional study, but should plan for a year of special post graduate training." It seemed to be the mind of the committee that, however much one might do in his undergraduate days as a theological student or as a medical student, he could hardly hope to secure during his professional training adequate special missionary training. We felt that in some manner he should secure another year of study, either in the same institution as a post graduate or in some other institution.

The fifth recommendation was along the line of summer schools. Dr. Watson has referred to it and Dr. King and Dr. Beach, and the committee favored what has been suggested by all of these speakers. We felt that much might be accomplished through summer schools if they were properly conducted. We, therefore, favored the establishment of such schools as rapidly as possible.

The sixth matter relates to language study. Your committee felt that the most urgent need, in the whole matter of missionary preparation, was along the line of language study, and, therefore, we call your attention to the report of the commission on "Language Study," of which Dr. Watson was chairman. I need not dwell upon that report further than to remind you of the startling nature of the facts revealed and of the obvious need of more scientific methods of language study.

7. "Opportunity should be afforded to all classes of missionary candidates to secure an adequate knowledge of the Bible and Christian doctrines." This need is obvious, but present facts and conditions are far from ideal.

8. Medical candidates are usually in need of further facilities for study, as outlined in this recommendation.

9. The last point has been dwelt upon sufficiently and very helpfully by President King—namely, that, while all theological students cannot be supplied in their seminaries with special missionary training, all seminary students, those who are going to work at home or abroad, should be instructed in the History and Science of Missions and in the Religions of the World, in order to develop in the home ministry an intelligent interest in the evangelization of the world.

THE REPORT

The Committee of the Board of Missionary Preparation appointed "to study the present facilities offered missionary candidates in institutions and 'Movements,' and to discover what further facilities for the training of missionary candidates are needed, especially in the following subjects: (1) Science and History of Missions; (2) Religions of the World; (3) Sociology; (4) Pedagogy; (5) Science of Language and Language of Different Fields; (6) English Bible," would report as follows:

I.—As to present facilities.—The exhaustive investigation conducted by Commissions Nos. V. and VI. of the Edinburgh Conference has been continued by the secretaries of the Student Volunteer Movement, who have graciously placed at the disposal of your Committee the replies to their most recent questionaires. An examination of this material suggests that very little has been undertaken, by American theological institutions, along the line of "special missionary training."

As to (1) Science and History of Missions, and (2) Religions of the World:

> "Fifty per cent of the whole number reported that the study of Missions forms an integral part of the required curriculum. In most cases, however, the required courses are brief and often fragmentary. * * * The time usually allotted for these courses is one hour per week during one year of the three years' course, or about two per cent of the whole number of curriculum hours. Of these institutions eleven have elective courses in addition, and nineteen others give all their missionary instruction in the form of elective courses. * * * Thirty per cent of the institutions reported that they did not include the study of missions in their curricula, either in the form of required or elective courses." [Edinburgh Conference Report, Vol. VI., pp. 78-83 and 173-177. Also Vol. V., pp. 72-81 and 89-93.]

These branches of study are given a more or less prominent place in the curricula of most Bible and Missionary Training Schools. It will be remembered also that such "Movements" as the Student Volunteer Movement, the Missionary Education Movement, the various Young People's and Women's Societies, have established a great number of voluntary mission study classes and done much to stimulate mission study and to guide the reading of missionary literature.

Instruction in (3) Sociology is given by nearly all the theological institutions and training schools.

Excellent opportunities for the study of (4) Pedagogy are offered by a number of colleges and universities; and courses in "religious pedagagy" are offered in connection with some seminaries and training schools.

As to (5) Science of Language and Language of Different Fields, not much instruction has been attempted with a view to missionary service; but some special courses are being offered in the study of Phonetics, and also in Chinese, Arabic, Turkish, Syriac, Armenian, Coptic and Ethiopic.

In all theological institutions and training schools the study of (6) the Bible is given a prominent place; yet some of these institutions fail to give such instruction as secures for the student a broad and comprehensive knowledge of the Bible as a whole and of the contents of its several books.

II.—In "discovering *what further facilities are needed*" it is necessary to consider the following important questions:

(1) What is to be regarded as the ideal or necessary standard of missionary training and equipment?

(2) Are there to be established on the mission fields an increasing number of institutions for the special training of missionaries; and, if so, what part of this training should be given by these institutions and what part should be given at home?

(3) How shall the "special missionary training" differ for the various classes of workers—men, women, evangelists, physicians, teachers, laymen, etc.?

(4) In the case of any one candidate how far shall the three kinds of preparation be simultaneous—viz., general professional training, special missionary training, and preparation for a particular field?

(5) Is financial aid to be given by missionary societies to candidates who desire to pursue post-graduate courses for special missionary training?

With these questions in mind the following propositions are submitted for consideration and recommended for the approval of the Board:

1. Special missionary training should be thorough and scientific; it should not take the place of other necessary studies nor serve as a "short cut" to the mission field.

2. There should be established, in all fields where a considerable number of missionaries are ministering to a people of one language, schools for the special training of missionaries. When possible, they should be developed from existing "language schools." They should be interdenominational or union schools. They should give instruction in the language, history, customs, religions of the countries in which they are located, and also in the Bible and in the science and history of missions. The plans for such schools should be matured and published as soon as possible, in order to avoid unnecessary enlargement of the present theological curricula or the multiplication of missionary training schools at home.

3. Until and unless such schools are generally established in mission fields, it will be necessary that facilities be provided in this country by which all classes of missionaries may obtain at least one year of special training. This can be most effectively and economically accomplished if a limited number of theological seminaries and training schools provide special courses of study.

4. Ministerial and medical students should not expect to secure an adequate missionary preparation during their regular course of professional study, but should plan for a year of special post-graduate training.

5. For such as cannot arrange for a year of special training, or desire to specialize in certain branches, Summer Schools, open to all classes of missionary candidates, should be conducted along the lines followed this year (1912) by the English Board of Missionary Studies.

6. As to the Science of Language and the Language of Different Fields, the instruction of all missionaries and missionary candidates, whether given at home or on the foreign field, should be in accordance with modern methods and in connection with the science of phonetics; and the instruction given to candidates at home should be carefully correlated to that which is to be subsequently given to them on the foreign field.

Your Committee would call special attention to the work of the

Commission on "Language Study" appointed by the Conference of Foreign Missions Boards of North America, and to the findings and discussions contained in the reports of the Conference for 1908, 1909 and 1910, particularly to the expressed need of more scientific methods of study, and to the approval of the "Phonetic-Inductive" method of language study applied by the Rev. Thomas F. Cummings to the Urdu and Arabic, and applicable for other languages. Such phonetic study should be made possible for candidates who are at present receiving special missionary training before going to their various fields.

7. Opportunity should be afforded to all classes of missionary candidates to secure an adequate knowledge of the Bible and Christian doctrines. It is affirmed that such knowledge is frequently lacking in the case of medical candidates, of women, and of lay workers.

8. Medical candidates should be afforded increased facilities for clinical and hospital practice and for instruction in tropical diseases. These are denied to many, because of the limitations of the medical schools in which their courses are taken, or because of the large number of competitors for hospital appointments, or because of the great expense of post-graduate and special medical study.

9. Since missionary training schools are being established on the mission fields, and since few graduates can now afford the money for an extra year of study at home, not all theological institutions can be expected to provide adequately for "special missionary training." But they should possess permanent facilities for studying the "History and Science of Missions," the "Religions of the World," and similar branches of study needed in common by missionaries and by pastors at home. This is necessary, not merely with a view to the special preparation of missionary candidates, but in order to develop in the home ministry an adequate and intelligent interest in the evangelization of the world.

THE DISCUSSION

Prof. Ernest D. Burton:[1] The following paper by Prof. Burton on "Is it possible to add the equivalent of a year's special work in Missions to the present theological curriculum?" was read:

The suggestion that the standard three-year curriculum of theological study shall be lengthened to four years is not a new one, nor is it without strong grounds to commend it. The broadening of the field of knowledge in every department of theological thought, the enlargement of the scope of the minister's work by the development of the science of sociology and the organization of philanthropic work, and the extension of the scope of the Church's activity through the progress of its missionary enterprises combine to put a strong pressure upon the curriculum and demand its enlargement.

That these reasons are sufficient to justify a certain portion of the candidates for the ministry in extending their course to four or even five years, there can be no question. In response to that demand a number of schools in the country have offered facilities for more extended study, and some of the most efficient men in the ministry to-day are those who in schools at home or in universities abroad have added one or more years to the standard three-year course.

The present proposition, however, concerns itself not with facilities for further study of which the exceptional man can avail himself,

[1] Prof. Burton could not attend the meeting of the Board; his paper was read by the Secretary.

but with the lengthening of the minimum requirement for the average man taking the standard post-collegiate theological course. (I am not, of course, speaking of those men who enter the ministry either without any special theological training or who take the theological course without any previous collegiate course.) It suggests that to the pre-collegiate education and the four-year course for the Bachelor's degree there should be added a four years' theological course for the rank and file of students for the ministry.

It may be well to consider how the matter stands with other professional schools.

A small number of medical schools require four years of medical study in addition to a Bachelor's degree. These are Johns Hopkins, Cornell, and, with some abatement of requirements, Harvard. Western Reserve and perhaps some others, require three years of college work and four years in medicine. Chicago, Minnesota, Michigan and some others require two years of college work and four years in medicine, the first two years in medicine counting also toward the Bachelor's degree. Columbia has until lately required college matriculation for admission to the medical school, but is now raising the standard with a view to requiring two years of college work before beginning the four-year medical course. The great body of medical schools require less than any of those above named.

No law school of the country has more than a three years' curriculum. Harvard requires for admission graduation from some college, not insisting on any definite standard for the college course. Of the students who enter the Harvard Law School from Harvard College, sixty per cent have taken the college course in three years. Leland Stanford, Chicago, Columbia, California, Western Reserve and Yale require for admission to the Law School three years of college work in a standard college, the first year of the Law School counting also as the fourth year for the Bachelor's degree.

Thus, of the leading medical schools of the country three require for the combined college and medical course eight years, though in the case of one of these some abatements are permitted. A second small group require seven years; a third and larger group require six years, and the great body of colleges require less than this, most of them only four years.

Of the leading Law Schools only one of them requires a college course and three years in law, seven years in all, and this so permits the shortening of the college course as to make the total six years suffice in a large number of cases. All the other leading schools require six years, and the great bulk of the schools in the country require much less than this.

There are about sixty theological schools in the country whose curriculum is primarily intended for college graduates. I am unable to say precisely how many of these insist upon a college course for admission or as a pre-requisite to a theological degree. I suspect that not over one-third of the number do so. The Divinity School of the University of Chicago requires a college course for admission to its degree course, and a Bachelor's degree equivalent to that of the University of Chicago as pre-requisite to granting the degree, but the University accepts towards its Bachelor's degree the first year in theology, thus permitting a reduction of the total college and theological course to six years. This last provision, however, affects a very small proportion of the students and is almost a negligible quantity.

Thus it remains true that the standard course in theology is three years, and the standard pre-requisite a four-year college course, making seven in all.

It should be remembered, as stated above, that as things are now a very considerable part of the ablest and most ambitious students avail themselves of the opportunity to lengthen their theological course to four or even five years, either by continuing in the school of their first choice by going to another school in this country or by going abroad on the traveling fellowships which not a few schools offer to their best students.

Now, since any lengthening of the curriculum would undoubtedly affect first the schools which have the highest standard, the question before us is whether the Board should use its influence to induce the schools which now have a standard three-year theological curriculum resting upon a four years' college course to increase that requirement by demanding four years in theology.

To this question I am constrained to return a negative answer.

I freely admit that three years is all too short a time to enable the student to acquire the knowledge and training in method with which it is desirable that he should enter the Christian ministry. In particular I clearly see the desirability that the candidate for the ministry should learn more than he now does about non-Christian religions and lands, and about the principles and history of Christian missions. But that does not decide the question in favor of an additional year, for four years or even five are also too short a time in which to learn all that the student needs to know, and there are serious objections to the proposed remedy—which, after all, is inadequate.

The first of these objections is that the present curriculum, demanding four years in college and three years in the Seminary, delays quite long enough the man's entry into the ministry. I am unable to present an exhaustive analysis of the situation. I can only record my impression that in consequence of the rising standard of requirements for admission to college, the tendency on the part of the students to prefer self-support, or of the schools to require it, an increasing tendency to make choice of the ministry as a life-work after completing the college course, and perhaps after marrying, the men who take a full college and theological training are entering the ministry on an average later than was formerly the case. I am entirely sure that by prolonging the theological course we incur serious danger of dulling the keen interest of men in the actual work of the ministry and substituting for their early enthusiasm for that work an intellectual interest in the vast field of interesting study which the theological curriculum opens up to them. A few men can and ought to study theology in the schools more than three years. On a much larger number the effect would be harmful rather than helpful.

In the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, which is so organized that it is relatively easy for a student to begin and end his course at any time, and men do, in fact, pursue their course not in classes but as individuals, it is constantly necessary to be on our guard against allowing men to stay too long. Some of the best men have now and then to be forcibly required to leave the school.

The second objection that I have to the proposal is the very great cost involved. If it is proposed simply to make it possible for the exceptional man to lengthen his course to four or five years, the opportunity for that already exists in half a dozen schools of the country and abroad. That, however, is not the proposition before us. It contem-

plates a general effort to lengthen the standard theological course to four years. For the sixty theological schools of the country to carry out this programme would cost millions of dollars. It ought to be done if it is necessary to the progress of the Kingdom or will strongly contribute to it. For the reasons given above, I do not believe it would do so. On the contrary, I believe it would result in a loss. The end which is sought can, I am persuaded, be more effectively achieved in another way.

The remedy for the inadequacy of the present theological curriculum is to be found in two directions:

1. The theological curriculum can no longer even attempt to give to the student all the knowledge, within the scope of the profession, that he will need in the ministry. The field of knowledge, whether of the Bible, or the history of the Church, or systematic theology, or the social application of Christianity, or the present problems pertaining to the extension of Christianity in the world, is too broad to be covered in school days. The theological course must be regarded purely as an introduction to this field, and the curriculum must be organized from that point of view. It must aim to give the student a survey of the whole field, to show him the tools with which his work as a student of religion and as a promoter of Christianity is to be done, to give a sufficient stock of ideas and convictions to enable him to begin his work, and especially sufficient training in the methods of investigation to make it possible if not also probable that he will continue to be a student throughout his ministry. For this even three years is a short time; but by skillful organization of the curriculum it can be done in that time. When it is done the large majority of the students should be pushed out into the work.

2. It should be strongly impressed upon the mind of the student that his work as a student is only just begun when he leaves the school, and he should be encouraged, not only to keep up his studies while in the pastorate, but to plan for occasional periods of study in school. This is much easier than formerly. The Summer Schools and Summer terms of schools that have such afford an easy opportunity to take up definite work under competent instruction. Schools whose plants now lie idle for four months in the year ought perhaps to add a Summer term. The expense would be insignificant compared with that of adding a fourth year. But many men ought to plan not only for an occasional Summer term, but also for an occasional full year of study. There is a considerable number of schools whose wide range of electives make such a year quite possible so far as the school is concerned; the financial load for the student is less difficult than in the case of the fourth year added to the regular curriculum, and the profit to the man himself likely to be far greater. Coming back after five years or so in the ministry, he is likely to get fully twice as much out of a year's study as he would have done by adding a fourth year to the present standard of three.

For the missionary returning on furlough such an occasional year of study is, of course, particularly easy, and many are availing themselves of the opportunity. For the minister at home the difficulties are perhaps greater, but they can in many cases be overcome.

It is not precisely on the topic assigned to me, but I am constrained to add my opinion, perhaps in partial dissent from the Committee report to which I affixed my signature, that the increase of the theological course of the missionary to four years should as speedily as pos-

sible, and in the majority of cases, be effected, not by adding a fourth year at home, but by pursuing a full year of preliminary study on the field. I trust the day is near at hand when, for every great mission field, there will be not simply language schools, but schools for the study of the history, customs, literature and religion of the country, and of the history and principles of missions. The Language School of the University of Nanking is a happy augury, I hope, of what we shall see, more fully developed, in every important country to which we are sending missionaries.

In conclusion, then, I am compelled to return a negative answer to the question proposed to me for discussion.

Dr. R. P. Mackay: There are three or four propositions that occur to me. In the first place, every college curriculum is prepared on the assumption that it lays the foundation of a liberal education. If it does not do that it is not a suitable curriculum; but that is the intention. That being the case, we should not distract students so as to prevent them from taking the full course, completing the curriculum so far as that is possible. The first years in education are most important. They lay foundations; all subsequent years build upon these foundations. Anything that weakens the course will be to the permanent disadvantage of the student.

I notice that the twelve subjects named in this report are, with one or two exceptions, already included in the curriculum of our colleges. They are all there except the philosophy and history of pedagogy, phonetics and tropical conditions. These are the three not found in ordinary colleges, and it would be a mistake to interfere with the ordinary course in order to introduce them. The course is already heavy for ordinary students, and the result would be to weaken the entire course and do justice to no part of it. A fourth year would be better than that, although not likely to be entertained.

We have in our college in Toronto a B. D. course, which students who wish to do so may take whilst pursuing the ordinary course. They work out their B. D. by the time they are through with the theological course. Would it be possible to have a mission course as an alternative to the B. D. course—an honor course in missions which would meet the purpose in view? That applies to the abler students. The regular course is heavy enough for ordinary students, if the work is well done.

All are agreed that there ought to be some sort of preparation, either before students go to the field or immediately upon getting there. The latter may be the better; but, at any rate, there should be some course given not at the present time provided for in our theological colleges. If this cannot be done in the colleges, then let it be done by such a post graduate course as is already provided in some places. It is unquestionably important, and is becoming more important as the years pass.

The only considerations that stand in the way are time and money. Another year would, in the long run, be a saving of time and money. The man who goes out with such an intelligent knowledge of the work as would be acquired in a post graduate course would not only save years of time, but have an entirely different tone during the rest of his life. It would be for both Boards and missions an economy of time and an increase of strength. If so, financial considerations ought not to stand in the way. If it is important, as we think it is, the money can be provided. It does not mean very much, after all, to help a student to an extra year in special preparation.

Another consideration that weighs with me, but more difficult to

state, is that there might be a spiritual atmosphere developed where students are concentrating upon these special subjects that is not at present attainable in ordinary colleges. There is a general complaint, and professors complain more than others, that there is not the spiritual atmosphere they would like to see. Professors have said to me: "We would like to see something different, but are not able, for some cause, to reach it." Now it might be possible, and, I think, would be possible, where a number of men and women are concentrating in their life-work to rise into a higher experience in what the missionary life should be. If we are to have one of two things—spiritual vision or scholarship—then let us have the latter. But we ought to have both, and they are quite reconcilable. In my judgment, we ought to give all possible emphasis to the proposal before us—have such special courses and let part of the work at least be done in this country. It is not clear that all can be done so well in the home land, but part at least can, and, if so, ought to be done before going to the mission field.

Prof. John H. Strong: I feel that the imposition of another year on the prospective missionary ought to be favored only under the most compulsory reasons.

In the first place, the course of preparation is long and costly as it is. I was recently looking over a series of autobiographical accounts written in the interests of our faculty at Rochester by the incoming students, and I was amazed at the vicissitudes, the struggles with poverty, the alternations of occupation, the interruptions of study, through which those men had already pushed to arrive at a theological seminary. While some few individuals may be swept through luxuriously by their friends and parents, most of the men pay a big price of self-sacrifice and rigorous economy and outside labor; and while that may only seem a proper price for a man to pay who is entering such a work as that, and while anyone who is not willing to pay a price of that kind would demonstrate thereby his own incompetence, at the same time I think we ought to remember that it is "by hope" that these men have been saved through their whole course, and an unnecessary deferring of the active work for which they have been suffering and sacrificing so much ought to be avoided.

In the second place, the men as they get out now are already not young. Twenty-seven or twenty-eight years old, isn't that it? The time of plasticity is leaving them. The time at which they are open to the easy acquisition of knowledge and of the new spirit of a people is going. The time at which they are acceptable to the Boards is going; and who knows but the very year on which we lay hands for special study might not be in the foreign field a strategic year in many an instance?

In the third place, there are grave dangers to the religious life and ultimate success of men involved in protracted periods of theoretical study. Too many theological students are trained away from the world, away from their early simplicity and ardor, away from the very thing that they are sent out to stand for. There is an evaporation of faith in too many instances in theological seminaries which only the utmost vigilance and prayer and watch-care are able to counteract; and for us to still further separate a man from his active work by interposing another year of theoretical and the cloistered life is hazardous.

Well, shall these added studies, then, *be inserted* into the ordinary theological course as it now exists? Shall they be compressed into that course, while retaining the things which we are now giving ministerial students? Such a course is attended with great difficulties. It may

be, as has been said this morning, that there is not as much demanded of theological students as of medical students; but I think we have to remember the different genius of the theological course as compared with the medical course. There is much more cramming in a medical school than in a theological school. Theological preparation presupposes time for meditation and reading, time for a man to come to himself. And how many of these men come to us spiritually raw and unmade? They have not found themselves. They have no idea of the world. They have no idea of their resources. Many of them have no conception of the gospel itself. Now, crowded courses are not going to help these men. They are not going to get their instruction on the run. What they want is room and quiet, and that in the most religious atmosphere possible; and when I think of crowding upon such men still further work, I have no courage to face the consequences.

Can what we want be done, then, by the elimination of certain studies that we now have? Can we eliminate the practical work? Of course, there is a lot of practical work that men do. They preach, they teach, they do outside work. We have got to consider, I think, the effect on their own characters and independence if they are robbed of the partial means of self-support. I do not see, either, in the interests of their own religious lives, how they can be denied the corrective of preaching and of doing some outside Christian work. That is the one thing that holds them true. It is very impressive to me to see how men who come to us all upset, when put on the evangelistic band, will tone up and get their feet down on the rock again and begin to have a sense of proportion.

If we cannot discard the practical work, shall we cut out some of the other courses now given? Well, I confess I do not know what we are going to cut out. I have not that idea of a theological course as the infinitely elastic thing which some laymen take it to be who are so free in their suggestions of practically remodeling all that we are doing. What are we going to drop out? Are we going to drop out our Greek courses? It looks as if the colleges were going to try to make us do it; but I, for my part, think it will be a sad day for our ministry, both on the home and foreign field, when that great gateway into the wealth and truth of the New Testament Scriptures is denied the student. Are we going to drop his critical and historical Biblical studies? I do not see how we can drop them when the problems involved are being raised, not simply in Germany and England and our country, but on the very mission field where these men are going to work.

Shall we drop the Theology? Shall we send a man out without any idea of constructive religious truth, the genetic and the organic relations of the things which he believes? Shall we drop Church History? Not if these men are going to found churches which they are to inspire by the great examples of the Church in the past and save from the vagaries and the fanaticisms and the tortuous wanderings of that same history. Shall we cut out the English Bible? To mention it is to answer the question.

It is not my function to say what ought to be done. It seems to me, however, that possibly less than the equivalent of a year's special work might in some other way be put in. I wish I were fully persuaded that all these special studies are as indispensable as they are represented to be. But it may be that some of them could be put in—possibly by the use of vacations. For example, here are two four-month vacations which a man might put in in some summer school. There would be eight months—two-thirds of a year—for these studies. Would not that help?

Then I should like to see—I have no right to speak on this aspect of the subject, but may I say just a word?—I should like to see, say, the last vacation, or an equal period of time, spent under supervision corresponding to that which the China Inland Mission furnishes in its homes, where a man is under the most careful scrutiny and tutelage; where he shows, perhaps, how much knack he has at getting hold of a spoken language; where he proves spontaneously how much love for souls he has by the amount of personal work he is doing; where he shows how much faith he has by the amount he prays, and how much co-operating power by the way he mixes and gets on with other people. The Boards would be helped by such a process, in which those incapables could be weeded out who go abroad, in spite of all the scrutiny we can give them, to become a discouragement to themselves and a burden to others. The selective process in a theological seminary is not complete. I should like to see more homes of that kind, furnishing a religious atmosphere where men would be made to glow in soul and enter from a baptismal experience upon the work abroad which they have set themselves to do.

Pres. C. T. Paul: It is not at all easy to give a rightly discriminating and impartial reply to this question, because of the many issues involved in it, and because of the widely divergent views that have been expressed, not only by missionaries on the field, but by missionary experts at home.

The report of Dr. Erdman's committee practically assumes the validity of the main positions of the Edinburgh report concerning the necessity of higher standards and higher practice in missionary preparation. Concerning that necessity no longer any doubt or question seems to exist. This conviction is strengthened by the presentation of Dr. Barton's report this morning. Now, a very significant element in the situation is the fact that the expression which has been given by the Edinburgh Conference and by the committees here at work regarding the necessity of higher missionary education is based on the appeals and the demands of the present foreign missionary body, and therefore, of course, casts no discourteous reflection upon them. Our problem is to make adequate response to what the missionaries on the field have asked the home church to do.

It is from the missionaries that the severest criticisms of the present inadequacy in missionary preparation have come. If I rightly interpret the report of Commission V, the missionaries are asking the home churches to produce and to send to the field men and women of superior training and personality.

The fact that the missionaries have already begun to establish language schools on the foreign field is not, I think, to be taken as an indication of a general policy on the part of the missionaries to attempt to provide all the disciplines which are recommended as necessary to special missionary preparation. We may take it, indeed, as an evidence of their urgency in the matter, and of an eager attempt to meet the situation as early as possible and as best they can. But we are not to conclude that the entire work of better training is to be relegated to the foreign field. I wish, therefore, to support the proposition that the foundations of the superior equipment required in missionary preparation must be secured at home.

In the first place, we have in the home lands superior facilities for giving many of the required disciplines. This is true as regards libraries and expert instructors who are specialists in their subjects. These specialists are equipped to do a work which even the missionary

scholar on the field can hardly be expected to perform—certainly not in addition to his other duties. I believe the educational forces in the home land are not only superior (as regards facilities) but ample and available. It is only a question of rightly coördinating and directing to proper ends, to the desired ends, the educational forces and facilities that we have.

Let us take, for example, Biblical training. Surely this can be given more thoroughly and easily at home than abroad. It would be a much more serious and ominous confession regarding the deficiencies and weaknesses of theological seminaries than any of us would care to admit to say that the amount of Bible instruction to fully equip a foreign missionary *cannot be given* in America. I do not believe there is one of us here who would like to say that. Whether it *is* being given is perhaps another question. President Mackenzie has emphasized in his report the great necessity for a thorough knowledge of the Christian religion in its historical aspect and in its fundamental teachings. Surely we are not disputing the proposition that this knowledge can be, and is being, adequately provided for in our theological seminaries. Or, if we go so far as to question whether it is being adequately provided, surely the possibilities of extension and development in the existing curricula are quite within reach. If a new demand is made on the seminaries will they not meet it?

I am struck by the fact, from my limited experience and from investigations that I have been carrying on for some time, of the general confession on the part of the missionaries themselves, that the great lack in their preparation has been along Biblical lines. Many are confessing their inadequate knowledge of even the fundamental truths of Christianity. They had not suspected their deficiency in this respect until they went out to the field and got into a different educational and religious environment, and found themselves called upon to state the Christian verities in a new light. Many, having found their knowledge very much lacking, spend a portion of their furlough in such institutions as provide Biblical instruction.

I think no one would contend that the preparation in sociology ought not to be given at home. In view of the great social changes that are now taking place in the Far East, in view of the general upheaval, the breaking down of custom and the almost universal social readjustment in non-Christian lands, we need to send out to the foreign field men who have the sociological viewpoint to begin with—men who have been trained in the science of sociology and have at their hand the experience of the West in social questions. If a man goes out to the field with this training he has an illumined judgment and a faculty of discrimination which will enable him rightly to interpret the social conditions and problems of his particular field, and to bring to bear upon it in an effective way his religious training and his religious activity. I take the opportunity of quoting here a statement from an article written by Dr. E. W. Capen, some time ago, in "The East and the West," on the "Social Changes in the East." He said this: "Christian educational institutions should, with deliberation, thoroughness and vigor, set themselves to the task of training leaders for these social movements." "He [the missionary] himself needs to have the training he would impart to others."

Surely the provisions for the study of educational science, or pedagogy, are better and more abundant here than they are on the foreign field or can possibly be there. Great schools of education connected with various universities are already available here with large

equipment and able faculties. It would be a long time before the missionaries on the foreign field could provide the requisite expert instruction in this science in any way to compare with what can be done at home.

And then in the subject of the history and comparison of religions, I believe that a certain training is absolutely necessary before a man goes to the field. He should be brought into contact with the general tendency of modern thought regarding the religious values of life, the meaning of religion and the place of religion in the constructive thought of the age. It is all very well for him after he gets to the field to take up in an intensive and intimate way the study of the religion of that field; but it seems to me he needs this general background before proceeding to the field. I received a letter just a few days ago from two missionaries in India—one of them, by the way, is the president of a college and also a doctor of philosophy. These men lamented their failure to secure a good course in the history and philosophy of religion before they went out to India. One said, "I can study the data of the popular religion here, but I lack the historical background. I do not know the underlying philosophy of primitive religion and I lack the facilities for securing it here."

Systematic instruction in the history and science of missions ought to be given to the candidate before he goes to do missionary work. That is something that he cannot pick up in just a few weeks. It is a pretty broad field. The superior library facilities, such as the great missionary library at Yale, and the growing number of instructors in these subjects in seminaries and elsewhere at home, would justify us in recommending the incorporation of such subjects in the educational policy here.

A word about language study. The Edinburgh report left the question as to whether language study should be entered upon at home or taken wholly on the field, an open but a vital question. Perhaps there is no subject mentioned on which more divergent and even conflicting opinions have been offered. On one phase of this question we are, however, rapidly coming to agreement, viz.: that every missionary going out should at least have an introduction to the science of phonetics, some training in special methods of language study, and also an introduction to the science of philology in general. It is a very helpful thing to create in the future missionary a scientific appreciation of linguistic phenomena, an intellectual interest in the question of language acquisition, and I believe that can better be done at home than abroad.

And I am not so sure that a good deal more might not be done in the way of actual instruction in the vernaculars, at home, than is generally supposed. In 1905 I had the pleasure of traveling to the East with a company of Belgian Catholic missionaries. There were about twenty of them in the group. During their seminary years these men had taken a course in Chinese under an instructor who had been brought from China. They had been instructed in the language for six years and were actually going out to China with a fairly good conversational knowledge of the language, and able to read quite fluently. Obviously these men were going to their work with a very great advantage over the missionaries who go out with no such instruction. I firmly believe that a useful beginning might be made under certain conditions at home in the study of the vernaculars, or at least certain of the great languages, like Hindi, Arabic, Japanese and Chinese. Of course, everything would depend on the instructors and upon the gen-

eral conditions, but I believe that these conditions could be secured. Germany will teach us a good deal in this respect, and I have no doubt the proposed School of Oriental Studies in London will have some valuable lessons for us.

Just a word in conclusion regarding certain advantages that seem to me attached to special institutions, where post-graduate supplementary missionary training can be given. Several of the speakers have referred to the possibility of turning out a man very highly skilled intellectually but with his spiritual life cold and dried up. If I may be permitted to refer to a little personal experience, I have this testimony to bear regarding our own institution at Indianapolis. We had last year a group of sixteen, all of them post-graduate students. Seven of them went out to three continents this year. They bear witness to the great value to them, during their special preparation, of their association with others who were making similar preparation. To have a group of students with the same great life purpose, looking forward to the same great end, interested in the same things, pursuing special missionary studies in a vital spiritual atmosphere, is certainly a great advantage in relation to missionary education. Good results have already been secured in such institutions in the development of a strong spiritual life. There is, of course, a danger that students in such special institutions may become too theoretical, as Dr. Strong suggested. But provision can be made against that possibility. We require all of our students to do practical work while they are pursuing these higher missionary studies with us. We have a population of about eight thousand foreigners down in the center of Indianapolis, where we have opened a school and a mission. In this mission and school we have put all of our candidates to work. It is a good place in which to test them out and to see what they can do.

Experience leads me to favor special missionary instruction at home before the candidate goes out. I think it ought to be post-graduate work, extending over at least one year.

Dr. R. E. Speer: I understand that this question relates, not to the great body of educational equipment which missionary candidates require and which does not differ essentially in their case from the preparation required by Christian workers at home, but to the special training which missionary candidates should receive in addition to that preparation which will represent by far the larger portion of their equipment; and that the further question is as to whether that special training should be provided in the regular schools that now exist or in special schools established for the purpose, and, if the latter, whether the special schools should be in the home land or on the foreign mission field.

In the first place, my own conviction is that as much of this special training as possible should be given in the existing regular schools, for the reasons that have already been suggested this morning by President King and others, and for these two that I should like to mention in addition:

First, the weakness of too much isolated and inbred specialization of training in any particular line. Now the strength of the missionary societies in Germany has lain in their having these schools. That is also their weakness. And the weakest period in the history of the great English missionary societies was the period when they had to resort to such schools to produce their missionaries. They know that they are in a far better position now, where they get university men, trained in a great variety of schools, than where they have a single type, a

particular brand of men, sent out from their own isolated training schools. Their missions are richer. We get a better result with a composite judgment and temperament brought to bear upon problems than when we draw all our men from inbred, over-specialized institutions for their training. We see the same weakness in our naval and military training. West Point and Annapolis are great institutions, but they do not give to the men who go into the army or the navy that breadth of training and human relationship which we want the men who go out into the mission field to possess. That is one point.

Secondly, because the implication seems to be that if we have these specialized schools responsibility for their establishment and prosecution devolves upon the missionary organizations. I think there is a different view that can be taken of the history of the whole matter than that upon which emphasis was laid this morning. It is not that we have only come within the last few years to realize the need of the most efficient preparation of missionaries; it is that we have almost come to despair of getting it in any other way than by taking the responsibility ourselves. As a matter of fact, we have realized this need of efficiency for many decades, and the agitation has been going on for all that time; but the institutions did not respond to the agitation, so that the pressure now is for the missionary organizations to recognize this as one of their functions.

Now, they were not established to carry on any such function. The Church's idea was not that the missionary boards were responsible both for carrying on the missionary work and for educating the agents for it. The colleges were established for training men for the ministry at home and abroad, and our theological institutions were established with that as their function, and they got their endowments with that in view. Now with all that money laid in their hands for the purpose of training the men for the Church at home and abroad, I question the wisdom of the foreign boards relieving them of that sense of responsibility and creating now an atmosphere throughout the Christian world which will lead them to find it to be easy to lay aside this responsibility and to require the missionary boards to take on this additional function.

Great business enterprises are not run on that basis. The Pennsylvania Railroad could not get along without civil engineers. It does not train one. It takes its civil engineers from Troy, from the Sheffield Scientific School, from the scientific schools all over the land, and after it has got them it gives them its own special experience, but it has no school for educating civil engineers. The United States Steel Corporation does not educate its chemists, does not even educate its blast-furnace engineers. It takes its men from technical schools which have been established for the purpose of giving that technical education, and then in actual apprentice work gives them the additional training which they require.

Now those are the additional reasons to those that were urged this morning why it seems to me we should seek to hold fast to the principle that even this special training should, as far as possible, be given in the regular existing institutions.

But even when they have done their best there would be some further special training that is needed, and the second query is as to whether that training should be given in special schools at home or in special schools on the foreign field.

Now I doubt whether we are prepared to face the alternative in that sharp form, or whether any of us are now of a mind to stand flatly

on one side of that proposition to the exclusion of the other possibility. We all realize that we have got to feel our way along, and I believe that there is need and room now for both types of institution; that there is room at home for some special schools designed for the special preparation of missionaries, maybe not for foreign missionaries exclusively, but for those who are to undertake missionary work. There are certain classes, for example, like the young women whom we send out, whom the theological seminaries make no provision for. Who will give them any of this special training for the mission field unless there are special institutions that will take hold of that class? I believe there is room for some of these institutions.

Professor Paul has set forth adequately the arguments for the existence of such institutions here. Let me speak merely, without saying what was in my mind on that side, of what is to be said in favor of the establishment of such institutions on the mission field, not arraying this especially as an argument against their existence at home, but drawing out those advantages that are enjoyed by institutions of this kind now existent or to be set up on the foreign field itself.

In the first place, will it not be a far more economical way of doing the work? We cannot have one institution at home in any one land. The denominations are not near enough to permit it. There will be a great many of these denominational schools. The country also is too large to have one. We will have a number of interdenominational schools. The number of them will be greater in the home field than it would be necessary to have on the foreign field. It costs more to establish any one of them at home, does it not, and adequately to endow it, than it would to establish all that we need in the foreign field? We set up an ideal of half a million dollars or more as indispensable to the adequate equipment and endowment of a single institution of this type at home. We all know perfectly well that that amount would give us practically all we would need for the next ten or twenty years for all these institutions scattered all over the world. Would it not, therefore, be more economical to establish them there than here?

Furthermore, we can make them international there on the foreign field as well as interdenominational. The English and ourselves are not setting up two different schools in Northern India. We all unite in one in Lucknow. All nationalities can be brought together in a single school on a mission field, whereas at home there will have to be one inside of each nationality.

In the second place, may they not, in some regards at least, be more efficient on the foreign field than at home? The consensus of opinion—I do not say in all regards; I say in some—the consensus of opinion as brought forth in the report was to the effect that, in the judgment of the missionaries themselves, language study, the mastery of the vernacular, could best be done on the field. Well, there are other things that in time might be just as well done there. Educational methods can be studied in the big normal schools that are to grow up in connection with Christian universities abroad. It will not be long before we have our thoroughly equipped medical schools in the foreign field, in which the medical missionary can get a more specialized equipment for the particular field in which he is going to work than he could get even in a school for the study of tropical diseases in London or the United States. There will be other developments of this kind that will make possible a more specialized efficient training for missionaries.

And in the matter of missionary method and policy, while I agree with what Dr. Paul has said as to the work that should be done here,

how much better can that work be done on the mission field, with the whole staff of successful missionaries operating in the actual conditions under which that missionary is to do his work, to be drawn upon for the teaching staff for this school?

In the third place, in some regards at least, it will be more practicable. It will meet the matter of the expense of the support of the missionary student. Many mission boards will either hesitate or be stopped from contributing funds for the support of students studying in schools in the United States who have not yet gone to the field. There will be probably no objection to their supporting students studying in these schools on the field. They will already be missionaries; they will be in association with their mission and participating in its councils. The objection to the support of students will be far less in these schools on the field than at home.

And there is the further advantage over attempting to utilize, as Dr. Strong has suggested, the last summer vacations of missionaries before they go to the field, that we will have them detached from all those diverting influences that are inseparable from those last few months. We find it impossible to get hold of our missionaries during those months. Their last visits are to be made. If they are missionaries about to be married, the trousseau has to be got ready. All the home questions have to be gone over. There are a dozen and one diverting things. I think it would be impossible to get our missionaries into schools for the last few months of their stay in America before they go out to the foreign field. In the case of the school on the field the rupture has been made; they have broken from all diverting and harassing home responsibilities, and can fix their attention absolutely upon the work which they are called upon to do in the training school.

In the fourth place, it will be far securer. We all know how difficult it is to carry even our appointed missionaries right through to the field. They are detained sometimes even after the outfits have been bought or the tickets have been purchased for the field. Now, if we go further back than that and try to commit ourselves a year in advance to them in the responsible ways in which we do by undertaking their support in these schools, we will lose a great many of them during the last year of their study here and also the money expended on them. We have them once they have got out on the field during that year of special study. It is always a discouraging time before the missionary has his own work and all the spontaneous drawings which compass the responsibilities of doing that work. It is a difficult time. We will have them there on the field in relationships of encouragement and goodwill, where older missionaries will be with them, where there will be the good spirit of a number of them starting in together. I think we are far more likely to keep those who are training for the work.

Maybe I am speaking too strongly, but I only want to bring out the considerations on the opposite side from that on which Prof. Paul was speaking, although I accept both sides, as I said.

In the fifth place—and this is a very great consideration, as it seems to me—these schools on the field ultimately, if our ideal is accomplished, will result in one school, we will say, for Northern India, one for Southern India, one for Japan, maybe one or two for the Chinese Empire, one for the Mohammedan world. Now think of the immense influence of bringing together in those schools all the new missionaries, all the nationalities operating in those fields, and all of the different denominations operating in those fields. It will be one of the most powerful agencies in behalf of co-operative missionary work that could

possibly be brought to bear. Here at home at the best we will only bring together in our schools a few representatives of different denominations. There, if the idea can be carried out, we will have together in the most plastic years, when they will make friendships and acquaintances and break down the barriers of unacquaintance and unfamiliarity and distrust, all the missionaries who are going to carry in their day the responsibility of that field together. It seems to me a great advantage in behalf of schools upon the field that it will thus promote a spirit of acquaintanceship, of co-operative effort, and of mutual understanding and acquaintance among all the missionaries who operate in any particular field.

Now those are the considerations, or some of them, in behalf of these special schools on the foreign field.

Prof. Edward W. Capen: After what Dr. Paul and Dr. Speer have said, it is almost needless for me to add very much more, and I will take but a few moments.

There are some parts of the foreign field where the alternative in the minds of missionaries seems to be between having all the special preparation given at home or all on the field; and the point is, as has already been said, that we need both. Where shall we draw the line? It seems to me that those general subjects that apply to all fields, and certain fundamental courses for the particular field, can best be studied at home. This will lay the foundation for the more particular preparation in language, the customs of the people and all such matters, that will be carried on after the appointee has reached the field. Let me mention a few considerations in favor of this view.

In the first place, we should note the matter of economy. I am not now speaking from the point of view of the long look ahead, when it might be possible for us to get a large amount of endowment for schools on the foreign field, but from the point of view of mission boards at the present time. If the large bulk of special missionary preparation is done on the field it means that mission boards will send out appointees and pay them full salaries during several months or even one or two years. Experience indicates that one year's salary of a missionary put into scholarships will support from two to three candidates for a full year's work at home. Moreover, so far as the instruction at home is concerned, the mission boards are at no expense for providing teachers, whereas if these schools on the foreign field are to be a success the mission boards must allocate to that work the entire time of missionary teachers, or it will not be done with efficiency.

Secondly, take the matter of time. Not only will it be difficult for the appointee, if all this special preparation or a large portion of it is given on the field, to be content to keep out of work for the time required, but in a large proportion of the mission fields, where the conditions of life are strange and the climatic conditions are unfavorable to the hard, consecutive work possible in colder climates, the new appointee will be unable to cover as much ground, say in a year, along these general lines as would be possible at home.

Then take the matter of health. I was discussing the other day with the secretary of one of our boards the advisability of laying at home the foundation for language work. He was forced home from the field because of the complete breakdown of his wife and the impairment of his own health. He declared that he was very certain that if he had received at home instruction in phonetics, philology and methods of language study he would not have had his health impaired, his wife might not have broken down and they might still be on the

foreign field. Especially to women, the transfer from the familiar conditions of home to the very strange and unusual conditions of the foreign field causes great nervous and physical strain; and if by certain preparation before going out the strain of language work can be lessened, it would be to the interests of the health and strength of the missionaries.

And then, again, in many of these subjects it is, for the present at least, in the interests of efficiency to have this work done at home. With our greater library facilities and with our trained teachers we can give better courses in those subjects of which Dr. Paul has been speaking than are yet possible upon the mission field. Experience seems to indicate that efficient educational work cannot be done by those who mererly come in from outside for a portion of the year or by those to whom teaching is not their chief task. The teaching must be done by those who are devoting themselves absolutely to that work. This means either that we must send out to the foreign field persons to teach in training schools these more general subjects, or else that useful missionaries must be taken out of the work that is so far beyond the power of the missionary force to compass, in order to devote their time to this teaching.

It seems to me also that along the lines of what President King said this morning it is wise for us to lay at home the foundations even for the understanding of the peoples to whom the missionaries are going. We shall have to provide those facilities at home, anyway, because the missionaries when at home feel the absolute need of taking some of their furlough time for the further study, for which they have neither time nor strength when on the field. Hence, there would be a call in the interests of efficiency for the provision of such courses for missionaries at home on furlough; and if we have these facilities for missionaries they can without practically any additional expense, except for mere living expenses during the course of study, be placed at the disposal of appointees or approved candidates.

It seems to me that we are still in the realm of experiment as to the correlation of preparation at home to preparation on the field. Undoubtedly some subjects may best be studied at home and some on the field, and the decision regarding those subjects that might be indorsed in either group should depend on the result of the experiments now in progress at home and abroad.

Dr. F. P. Haggard: I think I can fairly assume that we all agree that some special missionary training is demanded. I think, however that we need to distinguish clearly between the various forms of such training. As I have listened to the discussion to-day it has seemed to me that we are not clear in our own minds; in fact, I have found myself rather confused regarding the difference between the instruction we propose shall be given under revised courses in colleges and seminaries, so that any student can take these courses with profit whether he go to the field or not, and the additional instruction which we desire to give to those who actually go. I think we ought to maintain this clear distinction.

Now, as I understand, it is proposed that we shall, in the first place, extend and enlarge the courses already in existence and revise them, and that we shall then add to whatever courses applicants have pursued prior to coming to us certain special instruction with reference to the particular work which they are to do abroad.

Let us note, in the first place, that this special additional work, to which I think we may devote most of our thought, is post-graduate

in character; and, again, that much post-graduate work is now being done by our missionaries. All medical work is post-graduate in the general acceptation of that term. Theological work is post-graduate in character. Then many of our missionaries are taking post-graduate work along pedagogical and other lines. They are taking these special and additional courses after their own fashion, according to their own ideas, without very much direction.

The question is how shall the post-graduate and special instruction of missionaries and missionary appointees be financed? Before we answer that we may inquire how students and missionaries have provided for their training up to the time they began their medical or theological courses and also their post-graduate course which they have been in the habit of pursuing under the old regime. Many have financed these personally. They were able, either in their own name or because of the ability of their parents or friends, to care for all their expenses to the end. Some have been compelled to depend upon scholarships or upon associations which have for their object the assistance of students in theological seminaries. To a limited degree the Boards have helped students. I say to a limited degree. I put that down on paper some days ago, before I had reviewed the situation as fully as I have since, and I have been quite surprised to discover the extent to which Boards have assisted students in these respects.

It is not uncommon for boards to provide for men to take a course in tropical medicine in England or to tarry in France, in Belgium, in Spain or in Portugal, to pursue language study and to become better acquainted with the peoples who are in charge of or who have political jurisdiction over the countries to which they are going. I know of one board that paid the expenses of an appointee while taking a short course in the consular school at Washington.

Then a number of the larger boards have been conducting conferences with their outgoing missionaries in the Fall or the Spring, as the case may be. This has involved considerable expense. These conferences are, in embryo, the thing we are talking about. For two years our own Board has utilized Dr. Cummings and his instructions in phonetics, and we are proposing to make further tests, although some of us are satisfied with what has been accomplished up to the present time. The missionaries who took the course last year are enthusiastic over it and are confident they will be able to save considerable time. The women have, I think, in most denominations, special schools for training their workers. We really have adopted the principle of providing special instruction when we go so far as we are going.

Assuming the importance and need for post-graduate or special additional instructions, how is it to be provided? The Boards are not prepared on their present budgets to finance more than is now being provided for. The funds necessary for this work must be in addition to what we now have in hand. The questions raised are, Shall the Boards raise these funds, or shall others raise them and vest them with the Boards? Shall they be vested in existing educational institutions or denominational associations that assist students for the ministry and for missionary work, or shall they be vested in new educational institutions and new associations? From one point of view it may be as broad as it is long.

I have been very much interested in this discussion, as doubtless you have, to observe that each of the participants has seemed to advocate the thing for which he particularly stands. The Board secretary rather instinctively rebels against the thought of additional expense,

and wonders if this work cannot be done at less expense on the field; our educational men are quite inclined to believe that it should not be left in the hands of our existing educational institutions at home, while the men who represent special training schools seem to advocate the training provided in those institutions. I think this is natural, however; and it is very well that we have had these phases of the discussion presented.

For the Boards to undertake this expense would involve a radical departure from their present methods and customs, and I say this notwithstanding the fact that we are able to point out the rather large amount of work they are now doing along this line. We have in reality reached the point where we should review the whole situation and see whether, on the one hand, the Boards are not now putting too much money into this type of work; or whether, on the other hand, they ought not to put even more into it. In the case of some of the large Boards it would involve almost a new department, meaning, say, $500 per missionary for an extra year of training. If our Board, for example, had to provide that, it would involve $8,000 or $10,000. That may be a high average, since a number of the men would not require anything from the Board or institution; they would be able to care for themselves.

Second, it would involve the Boards in some embarrassment. Mr. Speer has spoken of that. After you have invested in a man an amount of money sufficient to carry him through a year's course of special training, some embarrassment will rest upon the Board or upon the candidate, or both, if he does not actually go to the field. It is not true in the case of the minister, even though he may not ultimately enter the ministry, because the probabilities are that he has made some special arrangement with the theological seminary for the return of the money that was invested in him.

Third, it is logical that the Boards should have some definite relation to this problem; that they should no longer permit missionaries to go out without definite instruction along special lines and without instruction acording to courses with the making up of which the Boards have had something to do. It is anomalous that we should have a situation such as Dr. Barton described this morning in his own case and in the case of almost all missionaries who went out a few years since. If the Boards are to have a voice in shaping plans for this work it follows that they should at least share in the expense.

In the next place, if the Boards are in part to finance this special training, they will have the advantage of being able to control somewhat the character of the training. On the other hand, that control might narrow the scope of our plans and would probably tend to the development of denominational schools, thus preventing the building up of interdenominational institutions on a broad basis and, necessarily, with better equipment and higher standing.

Finally, to summarize what has been said and to make some concrete suggestions: First, this Board of Preparation may well address itself to the standardization of the course provided for students in their earlier years and help colleges and seminaries to so revise their curricula that men will be in line for missionary work, though they may not actually enter it.

Second, seek to develop a few schools abroad. Between the two sides of the problem just discussed I am inclined to lean toward the view held by Mr. Speer. I believe that we should lay stress upon schools on the foreign field. Dr. Capen is right when he says that we

must have schools both here and there; but I believe we should emphasize the schools abroad.

Third, that this Board shall, in seeking to develop, seek also to finance these enterprises, to secure such a degree of support as to reduce the cost to the mission boards. That is, the amount of money that the boards may have to invest shall be reduced to the minimum, whether the schools are conducted here or abroad.

Fourth, the boards should meet this minimum cost when necessary. On the other hand, I do not believe they should undertake wholesale to train men for missionary work, beginning perhaps in the earlier years of their theological course. They should not do what some of the English and Continental boards are now doing, and as the result of which, in the case of the Church Missionary Society, we read in their last annual report: "Another step adopted by the committee at their meeting on October 27, 1911, in the interest of economy was the discontinuance as far as practicable of the further training of candidates as distinguished from accepted missoinaries; but in December the Candidates Committee were instructed to recommence the acceptance of young men for preparatory training and to take measures for their training to begin in the following May. It has also been decided that the burden on the Society's general funds for the financial support of men during their training must be lessened and more self-support called out from the candidates themselves and their friends. While men will thus be thrown on their own resources, some help will be available, and no one, therefore, need be discouraged from at least offering himself by the mere fact that he does not see clearly how to provide for his support during training."

Dr. T. H. P. Sailer: A number of missionaries have spoken to me of the great advantage of further study after a man has had a short term on the field. Before one goes out he has only general ideas of what he will need. After he is settled on the field, has a grip on the language and an acquaintance with the particular needs of the work, he can come home and make his preparation to very much better advantage. I believe, therefore, that there ought to be some special provision made for men on their furloughs. Missionaries have written to me from time to time, saying that they would like to do certain work, but feared very greatly that their financial resources would not be sufficient. It seems to me that in many cases special provision might be made for missionaries to have their first term shortened so that they might have a term of, say, three to five years on the field and then come home to complete their preparation for certain lines of work which demand specialization.

President W. W. White: Two thoughts. First, referring to Dr. Strong's remarks about extra time required for preparation, may I repeat a remark which I heard a professor of theology make a day or two ago when we were talking over the problems of theological education? He said: "The seminaries catch the men too late." The whole question of the earlier education of our candidates for Christian work is hereby raised. It enters vitally into our problem. I believe that a practical revolution is needed in undergraduate studies.

My second remark is about language study. On the three trips to the Far East during the past three summers in Japan, Korea and China I have had opportunity to note the large interest which missionaries have in this matter. Next to interest in the study of the Bible at the various conferences which we had the privilege of conducting, attention was given by the missionaries in their conferences to the ques-

tion of language study. I wish you could have heard some of the statements made by missionaries in those conferences. Almost universally the desire on the part of missionaries, so far as I have come in contact with them, is that they should have language schools in the countries to which they go. There is a difference of opinion as to how extensive should be preparation in the line of acquiring a language before going to the field, but all are agreed that there should be language schools for special study after reaching the field.

There was general agreement also on another point, that, while chief attention should be given to the study of the language in such schools, there should be more or less of collateral study, particularly the study of the Bible for spiritual nourishment and growth. I do not think there is a general disposition among missionaries to introduce much more than this in addition to their study of the language. The preparation in Pedagogy, Sociology, Psychology, etc., which the missionary should have is not likely to be called for in schools on the field. They must be secured before leaving the home land. It should be observed that the schools which have been organized on the foreign field are practically all organized for the study of language and not for the study of other subjects.

May I add that the general impression among missionaries is that fundamental training in phonetics and in method of acquiring a language may better be secured in the home land, and that in some instances a start in a language may be secured at home? But, as a rule, it is better to study the vernacular in the field itself.

Dr. Charles R. Watson: The first remark I would like to make is with reference to language study. There are those who believe that all language study should be on the field, and there are those who believe that language study should be begun in the home land. But there is another group, of those who draw a very sharp line between phonetic study at home and language study on the field, and I think it is only fair that we lay some emphasis on that distinction and not deal solely in terms of language study as a unit.

Then, in the second place, I would like to emphasize what Dr. Sailer has referred to. The dominant impression I have obtained this afternoon is that the supreme opportunity, after all, when you consider the practical difficulties of the case, the supreme opportunity for special study is during the year of furlough. In addition to reasons given by Dr. Sailer, I would add this reason: It is not merely that the missionary does not know his own special gifts when he first goes out, but the mission itself has not yet determined the kind of work into which they will put him. Probably the first term of service will decide that. He has "found himself," the mission has "found him," and he comes back knowing what kind of special training he should have. That places a decided advantage on the side of training during the furlough. Now, this year, our own Board is experimenting with that matter, and we have made a small grant of $140 for each married missionary to enable him to take at least a brief course. Our missionaries are experimenting with this matter. They are taking all sorts of special training, but they are getting something, and we are watching very carefully the results of that training. But the more we have thought of it, the more we are amazed that in past years we have been willing to spend $1,700 and more on a missionary in connection with his furlough in America and then allow him to more or less stagnate without doing anything for his mental quickening during the year. We spend $700 to bring him home and to send him back to the field, a thousand dollars

for his salary on furlough, and all this presumably just for physical refreshment, when every man needs intellectual stimulus for which there was no provision, and he also needs spiritual refreshment, and I do not know that we have made adequate provision for that, either.

President H. C. King: I would like to say just a single word in emphasizing that point. There are few things that impressed me more in my time abroad than the need there is to have the missionaries get the value that could be gotten from their furlough. It is taken for granted that a medical missionary returning will wish to get up to date. It is not supposed that any other missionary has any occasion to get up to date apparently, and he is employed most of the time canvassing for the Board. I appreciate the feeling that the officers must have, but I am very sure that the need is tremendous for those other missionaries to get the opportunity for some further study and stimulus in the year that they are home.

I want to add just this other single remark. I think we ought not to forget in this whole question of special courses that the educational trend of these recent years has been pretty certainly away from isolated schools for anything, and that, in general, we are not going to find that is the best solution in the matter of missionary preparation. As far as possible the schools should be associated with a college or university, or else the isolated school made into a university in embryo in itself.

Rev. James L. Barton: I doubt if anyone present to-day thinks that the missionary societies will ask all missionary candidates, or any large proportion of them, for years to come at least, to take an added year of preparation. But I think we are all frequently asking men to wait for a few months and take special courses under the direction of the Board to fit them for the point and work to which we wish to send them. We have several now, three or four, whom we are detaining for special work. But we do not put them on a salary. I think $500 would be too large an amount to think of for that. These go on with their course in the regular way. We have simply said, If you go out, you must take certain added work, and they have taken it. We have, however, since this report was written, set aside $1,000 as scholarships, to be used not only for newly-appointed candidates whom we may ask to wait to take further preparation, but also for missionaries at home on furlough who wish to pursue further study. That scholarship fund is for one year, and is set aside to be drawn upon from time to time.

Our Board has given more attention during the last few years to special studies for returned missionaries than to added studies for newly appointed candidates, and we have looked with very great sympathy upon the desire of returned teaching, clerical and medical missionaries for further study. Many facilities have been opened to these, and many of the universities of this country are offering scholarships to missionaries, if properly applied for. That is one of the points to which this Board of Preparation ought to turn its attention—namely, the discovery of places where missionaries can receive graduate scholarships and fellowships, and to learn what courses are offered in the various institutions, that it may lay these facts before the various boards.

Just one thing more in regard to the support of missionary schools. I do not think anyone would recommend that the boards support in this country, schools for the equipment of missionaries. It is simply a question of possible scholarship in aid.

Dr. F. P. Haggard: I agree heartily with all that has been said about the missionaries taking these courses while at home on furlough, and we are advising young men to go out with the thought of doing

some sepcial work on their return, possibly shortening their first period of service. I think our experience is the same as yours—that there is a rapidly increasing number of men who are doing this. But the other side of this question should be brought out—namely, that we are depriving ourselves of the use of such missionaries while they are at home. I do not speak from the point of view of raising money. If that were all that is involved it would not matter much. It is not the primary work of missionaries to raise money. But the churches need the contact with those men from the field, and those who are most likely to need or want special instruction during their furlough are the very ones who may be best suited to go before the churches and make the right impression.

Chairman Mackenzie: I think this has been one of the most useful and illuminating discussions that I have ever heard on this particular phase of our whole subject. One has sat here and been amazed at the fresh contribution that seemed to be possible from each speaker in turn, so that we have got together a large amount of very valuable material over which to think.

I was very much impressed indeed with Dr. Speer's development of the value and the necessity of the schools on the field. I believe profoundly in that necessity. I think there is a still greater advantage than those that he named which grows out of them. These schools on the field will become centers of scholarship and of educational influence and great centers of power in the generations to come. If they are well founded and well guided, they will help to raise the whole ideal of educational efficiency throughout the region which they affect among the missionaries. But they will compel a more rapid development of the higher standards of efficiency among the natives. They will react upon the ideas, which are too lax and too poor at present in most fields, cherished by the missionaries regarding the amount of training that can be given, or ought to be given, to native pastors. It is an astounding fact that in India, for instance, they have only begun to establish a really competent theological seminary for native preachers after a hundred years of missionary work there. The thing is almost incredible. But they have got to it at last. Now, that movement will be immensely stimulating, and if, as at Bangalore, most fortunately, such a school for training the European and American missionaries could be put in the same place and side by side with a really good school for training the native pastors, you can see how the one will interact with the other, how mutual benefits can be derived from their co-operation, and how the establishment of the school for the Occidentals will become a very powerful influence indeed for the scholarly and theological ideals of the native ministry in that region. And that applies to China, to North India, to Japan, to every region where our Boards can undertake the establishment of such a school.

But, now, Dr. Speer said that it would be more economical than the work at home. I doubt that. He knows more about finances in the East than I do, and about the necessary expenditure. But it depends upon what you mean by such schools. If by such schools you mean men set apart, as Dr. Capen pointed out, to do the work, to give, not their holidays, not their occasional hours, not making it the by-product of their central labors, but their whole time to this as their service of the whole missionary cause, then the expense is going to be very considerable in the end; and that in two ways. You are going to have expense in the equipment and selection of these men, and expense in the maintenance for longer periods of your students there. You cannot

awaken an educational appetite that does not tend to become more and more voracious until some extreme has been reached; and if you awaken that appetite for thorough intellectual training among the missionaries on the field, and you offer to provide for it, you will have to give more and more until you have given a great deal more than we think of today. And that means not only expenditure of money directly, but, observe, you are going to pay the salaries of men who are set apart for that work; and although no one Board is going to bear the whole burden—I can understand that you will have to divide that up among the Boards—yet you will have the withdrawal of those men from active missionary labor. If their central and fundamental work is to be educational amongst Occidentals, then the missionary work is going to be the by-product and the occasional industry in which they engage.

Now, on the whole matter I feel that, valuable as the discussion has been, because of the immense variety of practical experience represented in this little group, yet we are hampered by the fact that we are talking a little in the air. We have not yet got enough experience to form sound conclusions on any of these matters in detail. I do not feel that I have, although I have been working at it personally for some years and investigating as far as I could. If you should ask me, "Should we have schools on the field or at home? What should we teach on the field, and what should we teach at home? How much time should we devote respectively to the one or to the other? What expenditures would be justified for the one form as compared with the other?" I could not answer any one of those questions, except the first of all, which I would answer in the way we have all answered it—we must have schools both at home and abroad.

There is one point, however, that has not been brought out, which seems to me extremely important, with reference to the establishment of such schools at home. It goes down to what I may call educational theory. It goes down to this question: Does a young man more quickly acquire knowledge in all the various subjects that open to him if he is plunged into the field without scientific preparation, or is there a form of preparation that can be given to him by one solid year spent upon them here, which at the end of one year in the field will in these subjects put him ahead of the men that went out raw and spent two years there? I am thinking now, not of languages, but of such subjects as the religious history, customs, institutions, etc., of a particular field.

Now there are those who hold—and we have got to find out whether they are right or wrong, and that can only be done by experiment such as we are carrying on—there are those who hold, and missionaries are among them, that if you take a young man straight from the seminary out into the field and *then* give him his books, in English, with which to begin the study of these things, with all the phenomena around him, you are taking the slower and less thorough method. To begin with, you are hampering his acquisition of the language; for a man learning a language ought to have no English reading at all. Expert teachers of modern languages in Europe will teach a language in six weeks to a man who does not know a word of it to start with, so that he can get along in conversation, on one condition—that that man reads no books, no newspapers, and has no conversation in his native language. But what do we do with our young missionaries when we send them to India or China? We send them there to live in a compound; we set them there surrounded by English books; and we say,

Now we want you to read up the customs and religion and history of this people—in what? In English. Now, that is not scientific. It is wasting time; it is scattering the attention. It is really unscientific as a mere method of teaching the language. Then, on his other subjects of study, that man, in the reading of those books in English, in the midst of all the confusing phenomena, is plunged into the difficult task of getting at principles and observing phenomena at the same time. Now it is again questionable whether that is the most thoroughgoing, scientific way of doing it. It is a question whether these men, if they have the principles of these things and the fundamental outlines of these subjects ground into them under wise guidance at home, will not find the whole thing open up and reveal itself to them in a few weeks with a luminosity that could not have been reached in the same time under other conditions.

Now that is my abstract, prejudiced anticipation of what we shall find to be the case, and I acknowledge it is still experimental; but I want to see that experiment tried. I would like to see Dr. Paul and Dr. Beach and ourselves at Hartford, and others help one another to discover whether that is really the case or not. And I think we shall all be frank enough and manly enough to admit that it is not the case if it can be proved that the young men who go out without that preparation are, at the end of two years, better up in languages and better up in the knowledge of the situation than the men who took a whole year of added work at home, and even one year only on the field.

Now, that does not answer a great many of the other questions that have been raised here, but I do feel as if that were an important aspect of the question that has to be considered as we go on with our as yet inconclusive experimentation.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE III

ON COURSES OF READING FOR CANDIDATES UNDER APPOINTMENT FOR MISSIONARY SERVICE AND FOR MISSIONARIES

Members of the committee: Rev. William I. Chamberlain, Ph. D., Chairman; Prof. Harlan P. Beach, M. A., Prof. Edward W. Capen, Ph. D., President Henry C. King, Ph. D., President C. T. Paul, Ph. D., Dean James E. Russell, Ph. D., T. H. P. Sailer, Ph. D.

PRESENTED BY DR. WILLIAM I. CHAMBERLAIN, PH. D., CHAIRMAN

Dr. Chamberlain: The tentative report of this committee is submitted in typewritten form. I took the responsibility on behalf of the committee of withholding this report from printed form for what appeared to me to be obvious reasons. The discussion or the criticism that may grow out of its presentation this afternoon may easily result in altering its form. The title of each book is to be followed with annotations. These are practically ready. Should, however, certain books be omitted or others introduced as a result of the discussion, it would very materially alter the arrangement. There has also been some apprehension on the part of myself and others of the committee lest we should hurry too quickly into print in regard to a matter of this importance.

This committee has had the co-operation of such bibliographers as Prof. Beach, of Yale, whose former association with the Student Volunteer Movement has so much improved the reading of students in this regard; Dr. Capen, of Hartford, who has made a very valuable contribution to our work; Principal Paul, of the Indianapolis Training School; Dr. Sailer, of New York; President King, of Oberlin, and Dean Russell, of Columbia University.

There has been a definite limitation placed on the committee in view of the instructions received by us, which has made it impossible for us to take advantage of the reports recently published containing valuable bibliographies. That limitation grows out of the very character of our Board of Missionary Preparation.

The limitation upon us is in the instruction, "Courses of reading for candidates under appointment for foreign missionary service." This, therefore, necessarily excludes from our list that large number of books that appeal to the interest and imagination and arouse sympathy, because it presupposes a determination of the whole question on the part of the individual who is the object of our particular effort in this case.

There are two questions that arose in the minds of the members of the committee. They are indicated in this report—as to whether the suggested bibliography should be full and elaborate or brief and suggestive, and what should be the line of its divisions.

The admirable bibliographies recently published, to which I have referred, are those which have grown out of the Edinburgh Conference

very largely, primarily that one that was included in Volume VI, the report on the Home Base, containing two hundred pages of most valuable bibliography, and one that has grown out of that, issued recently by the Student Volunteer Movement.

THE REPORT

NOTE:—The report is presented in outline for suggestions and criticisms. The titles of books are included in typewritten form for distribution to the Board. They are omitted from this printed report until the committee can act upon the suggestions received. It is proposed that these titles, each accompanied with a brief descriptive annotation, will appear under the following divisions along with the full Report of the Twentieth Foreign Missions Conference.

The order of subjects proposed is that of the logical sequence which is suggested by the candidate's approach to the subject—his first broad view of the subject; his thought of himself and his qualifications and preparation therefor; the field to which he expects to go, its peoples, religions and languages; the work in its variety as missionaries carry it on; the secret of success as seen in the lives of great workers; then follows a suggested group of studies which he may have taken, but which call for special emphasis; and, finally, the study of his Board and its policy.

Superior numerals attached to titles will indicate the relative grade of the studies or readings as regards simplicity or fullness.

Annotations are to follow each title and to indicate, if necessary, special parts or chapters.

I. The Enterprise in Its General Aspects.
II. The Candidate's Preparation.
III. The Mission Fields.
IV. The Peoples and Their Characteristics.
V. Religions of the Mission Fields.
VI. Language and Literature.
VII. Methods Used on the Fields.
VIII. Successful Workers on Foreign Fields.
IX. Bible Study.
X. Education.
XI. Sociology.
XII. Phonetics.
XIII. Apologetics.
XIV. Missions and International Relationships.
XV. History of Missions.
XVI. Science and Theory of Missions.
XVII. Medical Missions.
XVIII. Literature of One's Own Board.

It is understood that where a candidate knows his future field he will select only those works which have to do with that field. So, in the case of Religions, he will read on the religion with which he will have most to do, and of the books suggested on that religion he will choose one or two. But even then the list is longer than most candidates will be likely to use. Accordingly, a list of ten books of a general character is indicated by an ‡ against the titles. These can easily be read carefully by a candidate who is pursuing his theological studies in an institution in which missionary instruction is not given.

[Following presentation of this Report several members of the Board offered suggestions. On request of Dr. Chamberlain, it was agreed that all suggestions should be sent in writing to the Chairman.]

REPORT OF COMMITTEE IV

ON THE FUNDAMENTAL QUALIFICATIONS OF THE FOREIGN MISSIONARY

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:—Rev. W. Douglas Mackenzie, D. D., Chairman; Rev. James L. Barton, D. D., Prof. Charles R. Erdman, D. D., Rev. Wm. I. Chamberlain, Ph. D., John R. Mott, LL. D.

PRESENTED BY DR. W. DOUGLAS MACKENZIE, CHAIRMAN

Dr. Mackenzie: The Committee, owing to the delinquency and procrastination of the chairman, was not able to give a very full consideration to the draft report that is presented here as No. IV. There must be a great deal of criticism of it relevant, and that would add to whatever value it might have for the people we are to send it to. It was written specifically with a view to helping the missionary boards, and that not through our own feeling that they require our particular help, but because so many people said that such help was needed in various directions, and that the missionary boards themselves would be the first to confess that they desired and needed help at this point. It is not always easy with freshness to put to each case what the fundamental conditions are, and the board secretaries themselves sometimes feel the need of stimulation and of counsel with others as to the best means of securing those fundamental qualifications. When the executive committee planned this thing, Dr. Mott spoke with very great impressiveness on the necessity for such a document as is here drawn up from his very wide experience of the missionary world and of the attitude and spirit of missionary boards. I raised the question as to whether it would not seem an intrusion, as to whether such a document might not seem to come with ill grace from people who are not so close to the actual work as they are, and he and others have assured us that, if the thing were done in the right spirit and in the right way, no such resentment would be felt, but, rather, that perhaps a very warm welcome would be given to such a document.

A glance at it will show you that it has four main divisions. In the first place, it considers the physical qualifications; in the second place, the educational qualifications; in the third place, the religious or spiritual qualifications; and in the fourth, the moral, personal, temperamental qualifications. No doubt this might be arranged in a different order. Some might wish to begin with the religious, as being the central and fundamental after all, but this seemed in a way the natural way to take it. First, that which is natural, and then that which is spiritual; and it seemed as if that were the order that might recommend itself to those reading the thing as rendering it most easy of apprehension. We have tried to avoid anything like dogmatism, anything that rang from the point of view of any one school, in any narrow sense of the term, but rather to speak in the general spirit of

the missionary movement, its intention and end. We have tried to set down those things, not that are fresh or unthought of and undreamed of by other people, which usually are not of very much value for anyone, but to set down those things which are of common belief and, therefore, of really essential and fundamental importance. You will not find anything new in it from beginning to end—I hope not—but if it succeeds at all, it does so by describing in the simplest and most obvious way that which we all know to be the group of fundamental qualifications for this career.

THE REPORT

During the last few years the foreign missionary enterprise has undergone rapid and sweeping changes. The awakening of the East, the spread of western education, commerce and industrial methods through Asia and Africa, the union of all nations and tribes in a vast international system of political, social and intellectual life are facts which create entirely new conditions for the foreign missionary. The very growth of the native church in missionary lands has also changed the function of the missionary, or, at least, has called into existence a new type of missionary responsibility and labor. Moreover, the missionary Boards and societies have come into new relations with one another, and in every direction are seeking, not merely to cooperate with one another, but, as it were, to standardize their work. Yet again, the agencies for the preparation of the missionary have been multiplied, and will soon be greater than our fathers ever dreamed of as either necessary or possible.

In view of all these facts, it is evident that the hour has come for a careful reconsideration of the qualifications of the missionary, in which all the Boards should unite for mutual stimulus and guidance. Without reviewing the past, we may from the present and future be able to discover what manner of person, in our new world, the missionary ought to be. There are four main divisions under which we must consider the fundamental qualifications of the missionary—namely, Physical, Educational, Religious, Moral and Social.

I.—Physical Qualifications

From the beginning it has been recognized that no one should be sent out as a missionary who is not certified by a competent medical examiner to be of good health and sound constitution. The foolishness of sending out the unfit, not to speak of the cruelty, has been always obvious to all. But experience has proved that two principles need to be specially emphasized:

(1) In the first place, different climates and different kinds of work suit different constitutions. A person who is not likely to live long in one country may be actually benefited by being sent elsewhere. Even within the same country climates differ so much, that a life which would probably be cut short in one part may be invigorated and prolonged in another. This principle of close discrimination can be and is now being carried even further, for missionary labor is now of so many forms that a person who would be physically in danger under one form may be in no special danger under another kind of work in the same region. A man, for instance, whose heart conditions would make it inadvisable to engage in much public speaking may live to a good old age in most valuable service of another kind.

These facts demand that something more than a technical statement, however full it may be, as to a candidate's physical condition should be sought. His condition should be studied in relation to various kinds of climates, and even in relation to various kinds of work—as is already done by many of the Boards.

(2) In the second place, it is a fundamental qualification for foreign service that each missionary be well grounded in the general rules of health and in the special application of them to the region of his future labors. This instruction should give much more than a superficial knowledge of a few rules, and should include the knowledge of some anatomy and physiology.

Nor should the Boards feel that their responsibilities end there. They should watch over the health of their missionaries. Especially is this the case when men are allowed to go home on sick leave. Men on sick leave should be treated as if on special service. It is when a man's vitality is depleted that he is least able to take care of himself and has least energy or inclination to use the right means for recovery. *Supervised* rest is what he needs. Examples could be given of valuable lives which have been crippled and shortened by neglect of this obvious rule of prudent administration.

It is not too much to say that in recent times a new conception of bodily fitness or health has grown up. It has become clear that, in a true moral order, physical health has a place of vital importance. The promotion of this health requires obedience to the laws of life, self-control in the matter of bodily pleasure, and systematic exercise for the purpose of maintaining all the powers of our human nature at their best. This noble conception corrects and yet completes the older notions of an ascetic life. It has, no doubt, its dangers, like all good things on earth; but it has within it great blessing for the whole race, and is most Christian in its true and inner meaning. To live for the body is not Christian. But, on the other hand, to neglect or despise or misuse the body, even in the name of religion, is not a religious or a Christian attitude.

This, too, is a part of that general view of human nature and human responsibility which has grown up, or, at least, assumed a new meaning, in the midst of our Christian civilization. It is part of that general and rich view of life which the missionary must take to non-Christian lands. Not only the men, but especially the women of some of these regions, need to be led and inspired by those who know these things and who have learned in school and college to practice them, as part of their service of Christ and as a condition of true and full communion with God through the laws of nature which He has ordained.

II.—Educational Qualifications

A great change has recently come over the minds of those who are at work in the missionary cause in respect to the intellectual equipment of the missionary. It has long been assumed that both the general and the professional training of missionaries should be of a high quality. Thus most Boards are unwilling to send out men who do not have at least one degree in arts, medicine, science or theology. The value of sound culture and the vital necessity of professional efficiency among missionaries are universally recognized, and they do not need to be argued here. But the change which we must describe has arisen in relation to certain matters that lie outside the scope of an ordinary degree, or of direct training for a recognized "profession." They con-

cern what has come to be called "Special Missionary Preparation." Specifically, this subject contains three elements—Knowledge of Christianity, Knowledge of the Field, and Mastery of the Instruments of Work. There are certain facts under each of these heads which must be firmly grasped if we would know clearly what are the fundamental qualifications for missionary service.

1. *Knowledge of Christianity.* The principle is too obvious to need defense, or even exposition, that the missionary must know Christianity, if his work is to have any significance at all. The principle has been very fully recognized as to the work of the ordained missionary.

All important Boards have made it a rule that the missionary should have the same training as his brother minister at home. And it is interesting to remember that, according to the Report of Commission V to the Edinburgh Conference, the missionaries themselves were found to attach very great importance to this ideal. With the rise of educational standards on all missionary fields, it is vital that the native Christians and their pastors should not gain the impression that a poorer or less complete training is given to those candidates for ordination who are going out to teach and to lead them. Rather is the pressure at present in the opposite direction. The missionary theological student must have what is deemed essential for the home minister, *and more.* What that more is will depend largely upon the enthusiasm of the young man, the wisdom of his Board, and the opportunities within his reach.

But the same principle, that the missionary must know Christianity, applies to all other classes besides the ordained man. It is curious and pathetic to realize how often this has been ignored. It is a fact that large numbers of men and the majority of women have been sent to teach Christianity without having made a special study of it under competent guidance for themselves. No doubt they have been examined as to their faithful acceptance of their Church creeds, and also as to their diligent private reading of the Bible and general knowledge of its contents, for the purposes of devotion. But far too many have been sent forth with little more, literally, than that. Today a great change has come, and it is universally admitted that no one should go out, even as a lay missionary, who has not had sound and real instruction in the Bible and in the exposition and defense of Christian truth. The need of this is too obvious, the danger of the opposite course is nowadays too great, to make any argument on this topic necessary, or even courteous, to the intelligence of those who are likely to read these paragraphs. It is not likely to be denied today that all classes of unordained missionaries, physicians, educators, nurses, artisans, evangelists, etc., must be not only advised, but assisted, and by the conditions of appointment compelled, to obtain this part of their training or prove that they have acquired it already.

It is, however, important to state four of the ways in which inadequate knowledge of Christianity hinders missionary efficiency. The first is the discovery of personal incompetence to meet certain situations, to discuss the claims and authority of the Gospel. If discouragement meets a man early, he becomes all too soon content to do his professional work as a physician or educator well, but his religious work as routine or custom compel him, without freshness and power. The second, which is similar, in effect, has a deeper psychological root. When the first enthusiasm of youth has passed such a worker is apt to

take easier and superficial views of his task. It is when the emotional life cools that the trained intelligence is needed. Deep conviction alone keeps deep devotion alive through the stresses and perplexities of an arduous life. And deep conviction is born of knowledge and meditation, begun in youth and actively sustained through the years. In the third place, it is only too true that superficial knowledge can make, even in a missionary circle, for fanatical quarrelling on minor points. And lastly, superficial knowledge of Christianity leads to superficial ways of presenting the Gospel and superficial tests of conversion.

2. *Knowledge of the Field.* The biographies of missionaries show that most of the eminent men among them felt the need of preparation for their particular field before they arrived upon it. This preparation they sought by means of books and correspondence. Experience and the growth of the work, as well as the readier means of communication, have made the preliminary knowledge of the field both more urgent and more accessible.

It is now generally agreed that special preparation, over and above the general preparation in professional training and knowledge of Christianity, is one of the fundamental qualifications of the young missionary. No missionary should be considered as equipped for entrance upon the field without it. Some of this work can and ought to be done privately. But most of it can be best done for the large majority of candidates by thoroughly equipped and earnest teachers.

This is not the place to discuss in detail what this preparation shall consist of, especially as the matter is fully discussed in Report V of the Edinburgh Conference, and not much further knowledge has yet been gathered which can throw light upon it. But some things are obvious and important above others:

(1) The experience of a hundred years has built up what may be called the Science of Missions. In order to know this science, the young missionary should have instruction in the history, methods and principles of missionary work and in those facts which come under the general head of Sociology.

(2) The student should not only have some idea of the general History of Religions, but he ought to be taught the nature, doctrines, morals and practices of the special religion or religions in that region to which he is appointed. All this he will learn quicker and better on the field if he has had good preparatory teaching on the subjects under competent teachers at home. In this paragraph must be included some knowledge of the history, character and customs of the people among whom he will work.

3. *Mastery of the Instruments.* There are two main subjects which may be named as Instruments which every missionary must use and on his skill in which the value of his work will very largely depend. These are the language of his field and the art of education.

1. It need not be settled here whether and how far the study of vernaculars can be successfully begun before the young missionary reaches the field. Only careful experiment can settle that, and no such experiments have yet been carried on in the English-speaking countries of Europe and America. But one thing of vast importance has been definitely settled in the minds of all who know the facts. The Science of Phonetics has been so far worked out and its application to the teaching of languages has been so well established that it is safe to

say this: *No Board should be content to send out any young man or woman who has not had a good course under a competent teacher of Phonetics.* Moreover, it is universally admitted that certain difficult literary languages of the East ought to be studied by those destined to use them, under competent western teachers.

2. There is no doubt that some training should be had in Pedagogy and Psychology, given with a special view to the uses of the missionary. Since practically every missionary is going to be a teacher of some kind, the immense importance of this is quite clear. The power of the educational work on all missionary fields depends largely upon this kind of preparation.

III.—Religious Qualifications

It is assumed, of course, that a personal faith in the Gospel and a personal experience of its power are possessed by everyone who becomes a candidate for the mission field. It is ridiculous to defend an opposite principle; it is tragic to trifle with this one. And yet the very assumption that no intelligent person will offer himself as a missionary without this qualification may easily lead to disaster. The motives which impel the young are varied and often deeply confused. And it is, alas! not unknown that a man should be sent out to preach Christ whose own experience of His power is utterly inadequate for so searching and exacting a task. The consequences can only be a long, dull toil, without joy and with the scantiest fruitage. The very charity and Christian optimism, which nowadays open the door of the Church so wide to the young and unmatured, may misguide us in the selection and training of those who are to be, not followers, but leaders, not occasional workers, but trusted captains and scarred generals of the great war.

For their own sakes, as well as for the work's sake, a high degree of Christian experience is necessary among missionaries. No doubt it is not so easy nowadays to determine this matter as it seemed to some of our forefathers. Different denominations have different ways of describing and using their tests. We have also grown sensitive about what we call intruding into another man's inner life. But the missionary is going to deal with the inner life of many men and women. He believes that he is called to do this. And everyone knows that he cannot do it successfully unless he has been himself well grounded and thoroughly illumined in Christian experience.

May we venture to name some of the matters on which every candidate ought to be closely examined by competent men and women?

1. In the first place, the candidate must be consciously possessed and dominated by a direct and personal faith in Jesus Christ as his own Saviour and Lord. There are many ways of describing this faith, many doors of entrance into its possession, and varieties of emotional experience in its exercise. Nowadays no rigid, rule-of-thumb method can be employed for expressing or discovering the reality or depth of this experience, in all cases alike. All the more need is there for examination of the candidates to see that they have the root of the matter in them, that they have made sure in their own heart and mind of the supreme power of our Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour and His supreme authority as Ruler of their lives.

2. Rising out of this, and yet in the Christian consciousness one with it, is the sense of communion with God. The missionary goes forth to preach Christ, not merely as a wise and gifted Teacher, su-

perior as a teacher to all others, but as the one in and through whom God the Father Himself enters the human heart and henceforth keeps it unto eternal life. The peace of God means everything to an awakened conscience, the love of God everything to a mind that is aroused to the terrors and perplexities of our human life, the indwelling of God everything to one who has realized that to be "without God" means "having no hope" here or hereafter. The Christian missionary has no real religious message if he cannot carry in his own heart's life the gladness and purity and strength and endless hope of an indwelling God to the world that does not know Him. He must go bearing the rich fruit of the Spirit in his own soul.

3. But rising out of this again, and necessary to this communion with God, are a man's habits of prayer. As the missionary is to represent the Christian life in all its acts and qualities, he must be a man to whom prayer is the breath of life. There is no safeguard for a man's personal character, there is no proof of his sincerity and earnestness, there is no source of confidence in his message, no secret of power in its delivery to be compared for a moment with the constant and happy practice of regular, sustained, varied and intense prayer. The young person who does not know this goes out unarmed to meet the fully armed enemies of his faith and of his inmost moral and spiritual life.

4. And rising out of this again is the fact, familiar to the whole evangelical world, the great discovery which made the modern religious world on its inner and spiritual side, that the man of prayer is a man whose mind is soaked constantly in the Scriptures. For this reason have all Protestant missions made the translation of the Bible one of the primary and vital factors of their work. No theory need be here attempted to account for the fact. The fact is that wherever the life of faith in Christ and communion with God and habitual prayer are realized there the mind and heart are filled with the meanings and the words of the Bible. This is the best inward witness of the Holy Spirit. Hence the Bible is not a mere external accident of Christian experience. It belongs to its very essence so truly and deeply that men everywhere confess themselves cold and heavy in their religious life if they know not how to hear God's word addressed through these pages of Holy Writ to their own hearts and consciences.

Every Board will deal through its Candidates Committee with its own applicants for missionary appointment in these matters in its own way. But it does seem that at least these four matters are of fundamental importance. They must be dealt with patiently, wisely, charitably, kindly. But they must be also dealt with firmly, clearly and decisively. The young applicants will be the first always to appreciate thoroughness at this point. They have no real respect for superficiality here. They are at times surprised and shocked at shallowness and misspent bungling when that which they know to be the deepest question of all is passed over, by those who examine and recommend them lightly and easily. Those who have the deepest experience welcome thoroughness here, and those who tend to resent it need it for their own and their work's sake.

IV.—Personal Character and Temper

The fundamental qualifications which must be named under this general head are best arranged in two groups; first, the essentials of character; second, the essentials of temper.

1. There are three essentials of Christian character which, while necessary for all, must be fully developed in the missionary. These are self-control, humility, and zeal.

(1) The self-control of which we speak must be exercised over the whole range of natural impulse and appetite. It is necessary to speak of this because, again, it is one of those matters in which prevailing charity, which is often unconscious cowardice and often issues in cruel and harsh experiences, leads us to take for granted that the strong and clear-eyed young man before us is master of his appetites and shielded by Christian common-sense against any sin of self-indulgence. In the great majority of cases this is a true judgment. But there are occasional instances to be found where a stricter and more faithful examination at the crisis of decision would have been as the very kindness of God.

The varied temptations of the flesh attack men who go to live for prolonged periods abroad from two sources. First, the wrench from the social pressure of the home land and the plunge into a strange world sometimes shakes the whole nature of a man. When the standards of the new world are lower than those of the familiar environment, there is a definite drag downwards. In the majority of cases this may be hardly noticed by a man of rugged moral strength. But where the character had not attained independence, where it was preserved only from without by the sustaining power of home and church and social circle, the removal of these props may, and sometimes does, lead to collapse, even in the earlier years of life abroad.

The second strain comes when a man, especially if he is living in certain climates and surroundings which encourage it, finds himself able to regulate wholly his time and habits and the amount of daily work. When the vigor and enthusiasm of youth decrease, the stress on the will to maintain diligence and self-denying service becomes very powerful. All men in the home field who attain to any position of independence, of authority over others, know this stress. But in a foreign land, where authority and independence inhere in the very nature of a man's position and relations, the stress is more common and may be much more severe. There arises the danger of self-indulgence, of laxity in the use of time, the disinclination to push the work hard, the shrinking from entrance upon new tasks, the tendency to do all work as a routine which is a burden, and not as an opportunity which inspires the alert and eager soul. It is better to describe this matter in negative terms, and thus to point out the general but constant danger, rather than to name specific forms of its manifestation. For in no two cases may these forms be identical, and each heart knows its own peculiar temptation and the path of self-indulgence which has opened most easily and attractively before it.

In this matter it is the duty of candidates' committees not merely to examine their candidates faithfully and carefully, but to instruct and warn and inform them. For this much more is needed than a single interview, and much more than an address delivered to a group of young men and women on the moral dangers which lie before them.

(2) In addition to this matter of self-control, the mastery of appetite and impulse, the other two fundamental qualities of character—viz., humility and zeal—may be named and discussed together. Though we do not often realize it, neither of these qualities can be effective without the other. Humility without zeal may look like, and often is, weakness rather than strength. And zeal without humility may be,

and often is, rude, inconsiderate and repulsive. The spirit of humility and the spirit of earnestness are one in the really deep-souled Christian missionary. If a man goes to his task on the foreign field without both of these, his labors are likely to be resented or despised. To win them both, a man needs to be well drilled in the school of Christ and His apostles, and familiar with the heart and manner of the great messengers of the Gospel in all lands and generations.

(3) In connection with all three of these fundamental qualities it is absolutely necessary to name the demand for that form of self-control and humility which produces freedom from anger and patience of spirit. Many missionary groups have suffered permanently and their work has been wofully hindered by the habitual ill-temper and easily aroused passion of some one of their members. In India, where ill-temper is universally considered a sign of ungodliness, and patience is regarded universally as a prime virtue, the man who cannot control his anger is a constant disproof of Christianity. Not all his eloquence and diligence can counteract the effect of that irreligious phase of his character. The man of impatience, of hot speech, of ebullient passion, cannot represent Christ among the higher civilizations of the non-Christian world, and misrepresents Him among the lower. The matter has been well summed up by saying that the missionary has "need of radical conscientiousness, of unusual initiative and of determination to grow."

2. In addition to the fundamental elements of Christian character, there are certain phases of personal tone or attitude or general temper which are of essential importance to the success of the missionary. Mr. W. A. Rice has given one of the best lists of them, and they may be named here as he gives them: "Earnestness, Clearness and Definiteness (in thought and statement), Tact and Conciliation, Courtesy, Gentleness and Patience, a Holy Walk and Conversation, Spiritual Equipment." In the Report of Commission V to the Edinburgh Conference the following list is given: (1) The spiritual or essentially Christian part—namely, love of God, faith in Him, hope in Him; (2) elements of moral character: docility, "the peculiar grace that belongs to a teachable spirit"; gentleness, "the root of adaptability"; the spirit of courtesy; sympathy, the true "secret of personal influence, the power that wins"; (3) leadership: the power which is developed out of the preceding moral qualities by a vigorous will.

It is not necessary to dwell on these in detail. The object in naming them here is that those who have the care of the young candidates for missionary work may realize how real is the value of close acquaintance with the personal tone and temper of the young applicants for service, and how vital it is to get them acquainted with the moral and spiritual aspects of those qualities which are essential to success.

The evidence of missionaries is abundant from all quarters of the field that very soon the moral and spiritual ideal of the Gospel of Christ is apprehended well enough by the non-Christian mind to be used as a standard for judging the missionary himself. His zeal, his sincerity, his purity, his patience, his unselfishness, his spirit of sacrifice, his evident walk with God, are looked at in the light of what he is himself teaching concerning Christ. What they take for granted in their own religious men is instinctively felt to be incongruous and shameful in him. Where he is self-indulgent, or passionate in temper, or lazy, or unfaithful to his word of promise, he stands condemned, and the Master, whose holy power he proclaims, is instinctively despised. When he is seen and known to walk with God, to be in dead earnest to win

men to faith in Christ, to be unsparing of self in seeking and furthering their various personal and social welfare, to be in his own character master of his appetites, his temper and his habits, he shines forth as a convincing, attracting, compelling representative and herald of his Master, the Saviour and Lord of all men.

Conclusion

In view of all that has been said thus briefly and by way of humble and sympathetic suggestion rather than of instruction or dictation, a word or two may be added about the conditions under which these qualifications may be investigated and inculcated.

1. There should be a prolonged period of personal acquaintance with each candidate on the part of those responsible for his appointment.

2. Where he has been already at work on the home field, full knowledge should be obtained of all the features of his work and of his past history.

3. No trouble should be spared to obtain, by personal interviews, as well as by schedules of printed questions, a full knowledge of the candidate's reputation, work, character and influence.

4. Repeated and prolonged personal interviews with the candidate should be had by persons specifically skilled in this work of dealing with personal experience and character.

5. Very full and patient instruction should be given to each candidate in all the matters discussed in this pamphlet and in whatever of real moment may have been omitted. Some of this instruction should be given to groups or classes. But no one should be sent out to the field who has not had the central matters laid before him fully and kindly and firmly and sympathetically in repeated private interviews.

If these rules are observed, not only will some sad cases of possible failure be prevented, but everyone who is accepted and appointed will go out fully forewarned and forearmed, quick to see the dangers to self and to effective service, and wise to preserve character unstained and the Divine fellowship unimpaired.

THE DISCUSSION

President Wilbert W. White: The report presented by the Committee is an excellent one. What I have to say is in emphasis of certain points, and particularly of one phase of training of the missionary. I am the more free to speak of it because your chairman, in requesting me to respond on this topic, expressed his desire that I give my convictions.

First of all, in considering the fundamental qualifications of a missionary, I think we should be careful to avoid too exclusive consideration of the curriculum of study. Our thought should include evidences of success in a practical way which candidates for the mission field have given. What I mean is this: Candidates whom we consider for the mission field should have demonstrated a certain amount of ability to bring things to pass. Mr. Spurgeon admitted to his pastor's college those who had actually proved themselves Gospel preachers. May I refer in this connection to what Dr. Watson said this afternoon about personality and leadership? I should like to add to these two, adaptability, steadfastness and breadth. This last is altogether too often lacking in the foreign missionary. There are too many now in the foreign field who have never experienced deliverance from pro-

vincialism of some sort or other. In thinking of breadth I do not mean that kind of breadth which a river has when it overflows both its banks. What I mean is rather length, breadth, height and depth, all from a center; a giving out in every direction; a release from narrowness of every kind; a real cosmopolitan experience. I believe this to me one of the most important parts of the preparation of the foreign missionary.

Again, I think, we should give due account, when thinking of the fundamental preparation of the missionary, to the limitation of time which, in the present order of things, is so common. This will require us to consider the number of secondary subjects and their relation to the chief subject or subjects to be included in preparation. We should fully recognize that it is possible for us under present conditions to make only a start in the training of our candidates for the field. Consequently, it is the more important that we should make the right start. I am sometimes tempted to say that I am becoming less interested in how far I get my students on the way, and more and more interested in the fundamental importance of getting them on the way of laying a foundation on which they may build for all the future.

This brings me to the core of the matter. You will have anticipated that I must speak of what is now coming to be called the Biblio-centric Curriculum. I beg you to bear with me if I, in speaking on this point, manifest considerable warmth. I have been with this problem in a sort of pioneering way now for almost twenty years. I sometimes in speaking manifest a good deal of earnestness and say things very positively. I beg you to believe that I am determined by the grace of God always to be considerate and to try to see things from the other man's standpoint. Some of you may think that I overemphasize this feature of preparation. Of course, I do not think so; but the opinion of some that I do is not without its balancing effect upon me.

In dealing with the problem of fundamental traning for the missionary, we are dealing with the problem of fundamental training for any kind of Christian work. It does not matter whether a person is aiming for the work of a Sunday School Superintendent or a Y. M. C. A. Secretary, a Minister, a Foreign Missionary, a Deaconess, an Evangelist, or what-not, the fundamental training is essentially the same in every case; and I maintain that its core, its center, its organizing idea, should be in a study of the Bible in the mother tongue. Will you allow me to define what I mean by a study of the Bible in the mother tongue. It involves more than what is usually understood to be included in Bible study.

As I proceed, will you please keep in mind the following three expressions: The man, the message and the method. What do I mean by the Biblio-centric Curriculum? This expression involves three things: First, a curriculum; secondly, a center; thirdly, a Biblical center.

May I speak first of the Biblical center, and afterward of the curriculum as related to this center? We hear much in our day about adding departments of study. This word "add" is very suggestive. A man as he grows richer adds field to field, but we do not add a limb to a tree. A limb is related organically to the tree. In religious education we are in great danger of being thrown into panic by the increase of knowledge. We must be on guard against assuming that it is necessary for a successful Christian worker to have investigated all the departments of knowledge, especially by the method suggested by the

word "add"; namely, the method of the tourist who goes from one country to another, passing through one after another in rapid succession. The problem of so-called secular education is not yet solved. Let us not make the mistake in religious education of assuming this to be true, and consequently hastening in our imitation of the secular educational system.

By putting the Bible in the mother tongue at the center of our religious education, we secure unity and definition of limitations, resulting from definiteness of aim. Too often in the training of Christian workers each department of study is conducted, if not wholly out of relation, entirely too much out of relation to the other departments and without reference to a central or organizing department. This organizing department I maintain should be the study of the Bible itself. The Scriptures should have the place of supremacy in our curriculum. Every other department should do obeisance to this one. The chief discipline in religious training should be a knowledge of the Bible in the mother tongue. But what does this involve? It involves a curriculum. May I here use a figure? The figure of a wheel. Our sailor (Sailer) this morning used very effectively the figure of the tide rolling in after a man who was running frantically away from it, and advised us, you will remember, should we ever find ourselves in such a predicament, to turn around and dive straight into the wave. Please associate my wheel with a rolling tide, and thus you may the better remember the two together.

They say that the wheels a man has in his head are known by the spokes which come out of his mouth. Here is a wheel which I have had in my head for some time. The hub with its center is the study of the Bible in the mother tongue. The spokes of the wheel are the correlated departments. These are either contributary or tributary. We might use the words concomitant and residual to define these two types of correlated departments. What do I mean by contributary departments to the study of the Bible itself in the mother tongue? I mean such departments as Language, *i e.,* Discourse, History, Psychology, Sociology, Pedagogy, Philosophy, etc. These may be called concomitants, by which I mean acompanying or attendant studies. Tributary or residual studies are such as Theology, Ethics, Apologetics, Psychology, Sociology, Pedagogy, etc., so far as these have been contributed to by the study of the Bible as above suggested. Think for a moment of what a definite purpose to master the Bible in the mother tongue accomplishes in the way of definiteness of plan and organization such as is here suggested. The study of the Bible having been begun, one is able to determine what demands there are upon history and the other departments in order that he may know his Bible, and into these departments with specific aim the student goes for that information and discipline which he requires in order that he may accomplish his purpose in respect to the Book of books. He does not waste time in aimless, general study in any department. Moreover, he has an inspiration which accomplishes wonders in the way of economy and efficiency in study. Every bit of information falls into its organic relation to every other bit, and thus, working from a center out in every direction, the student is ever increasing in intensity of purpose and breadth of view without being aimless or without unity. A person cannot study the Bible in any part of it for five minutes without seeing the necessity of knowing the history relating to the portion which he is studying. In his mother tongue, the words used in order to understanding will lead him into the history of his own language, which in

turn leads him into history in general and stimulates in him ultimately the desire to know the languages in which the Bible was originally given.

Nor can one study the Bible five minutes without recognizing the need of true psychological and sociological instincts, because the Bible has come through human experience and language. As this experience was wrought out, not only in the individual, but in the groups represented by the family, the tribe, the city, the nation and the rest, immediately also the pedagogical aspects of the Bible loom into prominence. Thus studying the Bible, before one knows it, he finds all fields correlated; and in his Bible itself he finds the unity and limitations of these fields as has been intimated. The by-products of such Bible study in the various departments mentioned are large.

At the risk of repetition, may I tarry here to make one point, if possible, in a special manner perfectly clear. The policy here advocated is that of going at once into the study of the Bible in the mother tongue, and then following the lines in these other departments which are manifestly required in order to know our Bible, instead of first spending large time and energy in these departments preliminary to the study of the Bible. The practical value of knowing these departments is made apparent to the student by his study of the Scriptures themselves and then from the Scriptures, in order to understand this or that portion of them, as he goes to these various departments of study, he has definitenes of aim and sufficient stimulus to enable him to accomplish much more in the time.

May I ask you for a moment to think how this method, if generally adopted, would safeguard the student in matters of critical study? I have no fear of any kind of critical study, provided it is introduced in its proper proportion and at the proper time. What I contend for is that critical study should follow and not precede an intimate knowledge of the Book itself. According to the too common custom, a large portion of the time is taken at the beginning of study in critical or secondary matters, the tendency of which is not to increase but rather to decrease the interest of the student in the thing itself. What I stand for I believe to be truly pedagogical, and because of the application of pedagogical science in this higher realm of Biblical study and teaching, I like to think of what I am advocating as the method of the Higher Pedagogy.

Prof. G. A. Johnston Ross: Dr. White, before taking up your next point, what do you mean by the Bible in the mother tongue? Do you mean each particular nation?

Pres. White: I mean that a man may most easily acquire knowledge of any subject in the language in which he was born; the language which he has heard spoken before he understood it, the language which has to him been interpreted first of all in attitude, in gesture, in tone, and then afterwards in words. The Bible is not intended to be a riddle but a revelation, and the message in the large may be secured in any translation that is anywhere in the region of being accurate. After the message in the large by the most economical and rapid method shall have been secured, the student is in a position to appreciate and to pursue with ardor the means for becoming master of the details of the message. By this means many students will be stimulated to study the Greek and the Hebrew, thus by the old method nearer coming to appreciate the value. My contention is that the Bible in the mother tongue should be put at the center of our religious education in such a relation to other departments as to stimulate all students of it

to work eagerly to know everything in every other department that it is possible for them to know. At the same time this vital relation in which the Bible is studied, with the aim which should be present in all those aspiring to do Christian work, will define the limitations of time to be spent in subsidiary subjects.

Before I say another thing, I must speak of the rim of that wheel. It has a hub and spokes, but these in themselves do not make a wheel. There must be the periphery. The wheel must have a felloe and a tire. This is furnished in our scheme by the vocational studies.

At the beginning of my remarks I asked you to keep in mind the three expressions: The man, the message and the method. Will you now think of these three in relation to the fundamental place for contact with the Scriptures themselves which I have been advocating? One of my associates, as we were starting home on our third trip to the Far East, remarked: "I feel we ought to go home and just make Christians." She was thinking of our students who were destined for the foreign field. This is not intended as a reflection upon those already there. It was spoken in the presence of the fearful temptations and trials which face the Christian worker in the world, especially perhaps we may say in the foreign lands. How is this to be done without large and continuous contact with the message of the Gospel together with the study of these other departments in due proportion? As far as the method is concerned, there is much to be learned of it from such contact with the Scriptures as is here advocated, especially when, while they are being studied, there is due proportion of a use of them in a public way. Let us then, in our study of this great problem of the training of Christian workers, seek unification, simplification, correlation, subordination. In accomplishing this there is not required so much a new essence as a new emphasis; not so much elimination, but subordination and limitation in many subjects which now clamor for prominence, with concentration upon the fundamentals. I believe that the Biblio-centric idea only is great enough and unifying enough and powerful enough and sufficiently commanding to produce the desired results.

May I close by quoting the words of Bishop Graves, of China: "Experience has taught us that the best way to teach theology is to make the Bible the center of all the teaching, and to devote the greatest amount of time to giving the students the fullest knowledge of the Old and New Testament, and in addition to teach all other branches of theology with constant reference to the Holy Scriptures. In this way the training is made more real and practical."

Miss Helen B. Calder: As I went away from the last conference I was resolved that I would try to have a higher standard for candidates coming under my charge; but we have been more or less compelled to take them as they came, and we have had to compromise a little with our ideals. It is some encouragement to know that there is a hearty response on the part of candidates to our appeals for better preparation of missionaries. I have found Student Volunteers most eager to hear about this Board of Missionary Studies. It is also gratifying to know the response on the part of missionaries to our attempts to raise our standard. Letters have come from missionaries saying, "We would rather not have any new workers than to have poor ones, for one poor missionary can undo the work of many good ones."

I am gratified that the Student Volunteer Movement is planning to publish this report of Dr. Mackenzie's committee. It will be a great help to Student Volunteer and Candidate Secretaries to have a leaflet

setting forth so high an ideal to put into the hands of young men and women who are considering this work.

Let us take up the points as Dr. Mackenzie has given them: First, the physical qualifications. I am glad that subject is allowed as legitimate in a leaflet prepared by this Board. I feel very strongly that there should be a doctor's examination, even before a candidate volunteers. It would keep some from volunteering, but more often it would enable them to rectify mistakes. I wish such an examination might be required or suggested. We should emphasize the proper physical preparation of our missionaries, because many of them have to be physical instructors, in addition to many other duties.

On the educational side, I am going to ask you to consider a change of pronouns for a little while, because all my knowledge of candidates is of *women* preparing for the field. I make no apologies because half of our missionaries are women. I would emphasize again the importance of normal training. We cannot be sure that a specialist will find his or her particular field, but we can be sure that every one who goes to the field, not only the woman in the school, but the man in the theological seminary, or boys' school, the doctor or nurse in the hospital—every one must train native workers; and the appeal that comes most strongly from the field is for that training. In some way or other I wish we might impress upon candidates the importance of getting some knowledge of normal methods.

I recommend most often a course like that in Teachers College for those who are going out to develop the whole system of education, it may be, for an empire. I wish we might make it possible for more of our missionaries to get that kind of training. There are scholarships for missionaries in places like Teachers College—very few, it is true, but perhaps there will be more, and maybe we can get financial help in scholarships from secular institutions which realize the importance and privilege of reproducing themselves in the Orient.

Since I have been in the Board rooms and have talked with missionaries on furlough, I have wished that candidates applying for service might know more of real conditions of life on the field during the first few years. Student Volunteer secretaries cannot give this to college students, because they do not know it themselves, and I do not know how it can be given. But there ought to be no romance whatever connected with going out to the field. I wish there might be correspondence courses on this subject with Board secretaries or with missionaries qualified to do this work.

I would like to have included in the qualifications a knowledge of conditions in the home churches. I wish there might be required a year of leadership in the home churches before the missionary goes to the field. The Christian Associations in the colleges do a splendid work, but college conditions are absolutely different from conditions in the churches, and from the standpoint of one who is working in the home church trying to interest people, I feel the need of appreciation by the missionaries of our problems. I feel the need also of the kind of help that the new missionary or the prospective missionary can give both for the value of such work and to prove real interest. Many Student Volunteers lose their purpose after they leave college, but if they are found working hard to interest a group of young people in mission study classes, or introducing missions into the Sunday School, they are proving that they really mean business and want to devote their lives to missions. Then when they get to the field they will be able to send

home proper information to the Boards, for, having worked in the home churches, they will understand the sort of things people want to know.

As to religious preparation, some of us have been trying to do away with the idea that the missionary is one who simply goes out to do evangelistic work, and we have succeeded fairly well. But there is danger in our success in assuming that every one who thinks of going has the spiritual motive. We must be careful not to lose the emphasis on the spiritual aim of our work. I would like to bear testimony here to the work of the Student Volunteer secretaries. They have always put the emphasis on the spiritual side of the missionary's life. But occasionally we come in touch with people who consider this work after they have left college, who have not been in touch with Volunteer secretaries. I wish we might keep before such candidates the emphasis of this leaflet on this point.

Dr. Mackenzie said there was nothing new in this paper. I noticed several things that would be new to many people, and to me in this connection it is new to bring out the point which I am glad he has brought out, and to which Dr. King also referred—the danger of laxness on the foreign field and the importance of self-control. In that connection I would mention the value of personal acquaintance with the volunteer. It is not always possible to follow up names that are sent to us by the Student Volunteer Movement, but when we can I think it means everything to be able to know from the earliest possible years candidates who are looking forward to the field. I have found it a great help to keep in touch with the girls who are just beginning their college course.

Finally, I wish, in preparing this report, we might incorporate those words which Dr. King gave elsewhere as qualifications for a missionary: "Radical conscientiousness, unusual initiative and determination." When the missionaries have met all these qualifications, we at home will have to resign and call some of them home to take our places, because they will then be so much better fitted to do our work.

G. A. Johnston Ross: There are one or two things that have occurred to me as I have been reading this wonderful paper. On the first page there is a reference to the physical qualifications of missionaries. Now I don't know anything practically about the conditions on this side of the water, but to a reprehensible extent Boards in England have neglected the health of their missionaries when they are at home on furlough; and I was wondering whether it would be at all desirable or relevant to this paper to say anything about the evil of overworking missionaries by deputation work during their furloughs. There certainly are young people who are afraid to go into missionary work because of what they find in regard to the use that the Boards make of the missionaries at home on furlough. Deputationizing is not only exhausting for men who are, as you described them, men of depleted vitality—and hardly anybody can be seven years or five years on the foreign field without a measurable depletion of vitality—you can't do deputation work without running physical risks; but besides that I wish it could be emphasized in a paper like this that too much deputationizing on the part of the missionary is a spiritual loss to the missionary himself. I do not know whether it would be possible for you to incorporate in a single sentence, in what is so admirable, as it is, a word or two that might be a salutary warning to Boards in this matter.

But there is another point on the next page where you speak of the evils of an inadequate knowledge of Christianity. There are three conditions that you have mentioned there: "The discovery of personal

incompetence to meet certain situations, to discuss the claims and authority of the Gospel," and then about passing the first enthusiasm of youth, and, finally, "superficial knowledge of Christianity leads to superficial ways of presenting the Gospel and superficial tests of conversion." All that, it seems to be, is simply admirable. I wonder if it would be possible to add that a superficial or inadequate knowledge of Christianity makes for quarelling and for fanatical quarelling about smaller points. It has often seemed to me to be pathetic in the last degree to find that our mission stations, because our missionaries are inadequately trained in Christianity, are hotbeds of dispeace, which are really due to quarrelling about minor points, and that often missionaries are hard fanatics on merely subordinate subjects. I think a training in breadth, as one of the members here in this conference has suggested, is most essential from that point of view. A young friend of my own, who ultimately did not go into missionary work, but into the civil service, after testing missionary work on the field, said that the reason for his going into work in the civil service and not missionary work was that he had a year in the mission station in which he had three things to do. One was to keep house, the second was to keep accounts, and the third was to keep the peace; and he found the last the most difficult of all.

May I say how very thankful I am for the stress which you lay upon the necessity for a personal experience of Christianity? As Miss Calder has been speaking just now about these freak cases of young women desiring to enter the missionary work who have no religious interest, I should like to testify that that is getting to be an appalling feature of the present generation. Some men desire to go into the ministry who do not even firmly believe in God and who have apparently no religious interest, strictly so called, at all. Whether it is due to the quite abnormal emphasis laid upon our undischarged social obligations, and, therefore, to the fact that young people accept the appeal for social justice as though it were the equivalent of a gospel, I don't know; but we are face to face in our theological seminaries—some of them at least—with this extraordinary thing, that young men desire to go into the ministry who have neither the desire to speak for Christ nor any knowledge personally of His power, according to their own testimony, but just want to *do something,* as if the ministry were a kind of exalted boys' club, or boy scouts, or something of that kind. The odd thing is that it is not possible for us wholly to condemn these aspirants. What we have to do is to meet this extraordinary situation with especially careful wisdom. But the point I make is this: that the emphasis which this paper puts upon a definite personal experience is of the utmost value, and the more strongly we can lay that before our young people, the better. I should like also to say how grateful I am for the stress you lay so tactfully upon the appreciation of the power of our Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour. The modern way of thinking of the Lord Jesus has this effect: I find amongst some of our theological students that they imagine they have quite got at religion without Him, or that they can pass Him by; having reached God the Father, they can pass Christ by with a respectful bow. I do not say they are unorthodox, or that they distinctly say that Jesus Christ was not divine, or anything of the sort; but the practical point is that they are going out into the Christian ministry without the joy, without the buoyancy, without the enthusiasm, which is given, so far as I know, by nothing so much as by the friendship of Jesus Christ. The idea of being the servant of our Divine Lord, Who is, at the same time, a human

friend, is missing from the experience, as I find it, of many of our young people in the colleges and universities.

There is just one other little point which I should like to see emphasized, and that is the need for our young people to go through the discipline of obedience. There has been a good deal, sir, of slippered ease in our theological training, in the life of our seminaries, and I cannot but count it an unfortunate thing that in so many of our denominations young men are put out into the ministry to be at once the masters of their own time; and I would like cordially to support the suggestion made here that missionaries should, for a time at any rate, be under the guidance of others. If it were possible to combine in one proposal this with a suggestion which came out of our discussion today, I should be grateful—namely, that there should be schools established on the foreign field for the study of language and one or two other matters, and that the period spent in these schools by our young missionaries should be a probationary period. Perhaps our Boards might at the end of that time judge by the results of the examinations of the young men and young women in these schools whether they could support a young fellow when he came back again to his native land for his first furlough in going through special training of some sort then; but I should be so glad if that decision of the Board were to depend partly upon the report of the president or professors of this school on this question of questions, as to whether this young man had learned habits of obedience and physical self-control. I cannot but feel there are a great many failures in the ministry at home that are due simply to the fact that young men have gone out without training in subordination of their wills, training also in physical self-control—matters of getting up in the morning and that kind of thing—who have gone out into the ministry into a position of fictitious and artificial social importance, where they are masters of their own time and ways and have fallen down in ignoble indolence and so have become anonymous mediocrities before they are well on to middle life. If we could prevent that kind of thing, which must be of still greater trouble in subtropical climates, by making this period spent in the language school at the same time a probationary period, I think it would be of very great advantage to our missionaries. Of course, I do not at all mean that young missionaries should be placed under a system of espionage or repressive control by older and more conservative men, but that they should have the advantage of a period of discipline and drill, issuing in a reasonable efficiency test.